Brooks, later Governor of Massachusetts, Colonel Ebenezer Francis, mortally wounded at Whitehall, New York, and his brother John Francis, who served continuously for 6 years in the Continental Army.

Daniel Townsend of Lynnfield was killed during the retreat of the British from the Concord fight. His body was found to have seven bullet wounds. His remains were taken to Lynnfield and according to an account written in 1875 "lay the next night in the Bancroft house, where the bloodstains remained for many years afterward."

One of the Revolutionary heroes of Saugus was Captain David Parker who mustered his company at an early hour on the day of the Concord fight, and marched it quickly to the scene where his men fought gallantly.

Although Chelsea was remote from the conflict, and the route to it circuitous, some of her citizens rendered important service. When provisions were sent to the relief of the British at Concord the convoy was intercepted at Arlington by a group of patriots led by the Reverend Mr. Payson of Chelsea.

The Chelsea company at Concord that day was commanded by Captain Samuel Sprague.

You have perhaps heard it said that history is to a nation what memory is to an individual. But this is more than a figure of speech; it contains a truth. We cannot afford to lose by neglect what is irreplaceable. We should all know our local, county, State, and National historical societies in their effort to save what is worth saving and which must be saved immediately, or lost forever.

There are many, many historical societies, and other similarly interested groups in Massachusetts. The directory of the National Trust of Historic Preservation lists the following member organizations in Massachusetts (and, of course, there are others which are not associated with the National Trust): the Balch House Associates of the Beverly Historical Society, the Beacon Hill Architectural Commission, the Beacon Hill Civic Association, the Castle Hill Foundation, the Chesterwood Studio Museum, the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Your Own First Iron Works Association, the Gore Place Society, the Historic Districts Commission of the Town of Nantucket, the Ipswich Historical Society, the Milton Historical Society, the Nantucket Historical Association, the Old Dartmouth Historical Society, the Old South Association in Boston, Old Sturbridge Village, the Peabody Museum of Salem, the Pilgrim Society, the Plimoth Society, the Plimoth Plantation, the Porter-Phelps-Huntington Foundation, the Shaker Community in Pittsfield, and the Women's City Club of Boston.

A citizen's interest and knowledge of the history of his locality and his support of its historical society is part of his strength in these times of crisis and peril for the cause of freedom. A major weapon in the incredible and nerve-wracking cold war in which we find ourselves is the preservation of the visual and inspiring evidences of our country's career as it is revealed in the ennobling architecture and places of its history.

We must not let the ruthless hand of material progress reduce to rubble and oblivion our great national landmarks, wherever they may be.

The aspiration of the preservationists is to perform a national service for the American people and for freedom everywhere at a moment in history which is critically dangerous. Their desire is to help make the American people, themselves, conscious of their immense contribution to the Western World in the theory and practice of free political and legal institutions.

The preservationists' purpose is to thwart the propaganda that defaces the picture of our country before the world. The goal is to present visual, living, documented proof, some of it brick and stone, in hills and squares, in parks and commons, in heights and halls, in churches and statehouses, in homes and military sites, in all of these, proof that for the American people the cause of freedom was always the inner soul of their being.

Not only would our own countrymen see and learn and understand from the truths expressed in stone, mortar, and locale, but visitors by the millions from abroad would come to know the elementary facts and ideals of our tradition.

Millions of Americans plan tours abroad to look at old cities and beautiful monuments. Yet the very things that Americans seek for abroad they destroy at home. Old buildings are broken up in the United States as fast as used packing crates.

The preservation of the American heritage is thus and in fact a prodigious educational endeavor. We are not collecting museum pieces. We are not providing entertainment and picnic grounds. We are preserving American history.

If we in this area hold our unique and irreplaceable relics in the proper respect, and save them forever free from demolition, we shall have set an example that the rest of the country will gladly and rightly follow.

But it is up to us here, at the very center of these veritable reservoirs of our past, to create and emphasize this sense of history.

The current Civil War Centennial celebrations accomplish such a purpose, and do something more besides. Such celebrations are not without their proper economic side, if this aspect of the matter is intelligently motivated and wisely handled.

It is my understanding, based on information furnished to me by the report of chambers of commerce, that some 9 billions of dollars will be spent by tourists viewing historic scenes of the American Civil War during the centennial celebrations. Here are primarily educational enterprises, saturated with historical significance, that provide as byproducts highly desirable and beneficial economic gains for the localities which support them.

But, to be interesting and significant, historic places need not be associated with the Civil War, or with the battles of any war, for that matter. Every year thousands and thousands of people visit Washington Irving's mansion, Theodore Roosevelt's home in Oyster Bay, Long Island, Franklin Roosevelt's home at Hyde Park. These houses tell us something about great men. They add to our judgment and taste. They are authentic American history.

There is so much to be seen in Boston and in the areas around it. The scene of the Boston Massacre, Faneuil Hall, North Square and the old North Church, Dorchester Heights, Bunker Hill, the Capitol Building itself, the old corner bookstore, the Thomas Crease house, Shirley place and the Shirley-Eustis house, the Old South Meetinghouse, the Lexington and Concord Battle Road, the Minuteman National Historical Park in the towns of Lexington, Lincoln, and Concord, all of these constitute an historical treasure trove. Perhaps none of them surpasses in fidelity to historical detail the Saugus Ironworks restoration.

I think that we may justifiably hope that each year an increasing number of our people will become aware of what needs to be done in the field of local history and historic preservation.

As you know, and as I know, and as anyone may see by this restoration of the Saugus Ironworks, when Americans become convinced that something should be done, it will be done, and it is done, and it is well done.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Martin Canavan, pastor, First Baptist Church, Long Beach, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, with gratitude for the privilege of prayer we again approach Thy throne. In the hurried lives we live we pause to seek Thy guidance for the deliberations which are ahead. Give us the wisdom to seek Thy will, and the willingness to be led by Thy spirit. Bless, we pray, the leaders of this great Nation and may dependence on Thee ever be present in the thoughts of each one. We humbly thank Thee for the heritage of the past, and seek Thy blessings for the future. This we ask, not because we are worthy, but because we come in the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1492. An act to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart;

H.R. 1819. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1937. An act to amend the act known as the "Life Insurance Act" of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the "Fire and Casualty Act" of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940;

H.R. 3537. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the municipal court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 467. Joint resolution amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4330. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; and

H.R. 5081. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House

is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6868. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. HUMPHRLY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. KUCHEL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia", approved February 18, 1938, as amended;

S. 489. An act to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia;

S. 490. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles, and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained;

S. 743. An act to furnish to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 995. An act to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes; and

S. 1163. An act to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6791) entitled "An act to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the Report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 63–14.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk may be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker may be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM TUESDAY, JULY 2, TO FRIDAY, JULY 5, AND FROM FRIDAY, JULY 5, TO MONDAY, JULY 8

Mr. ALBERT. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, July 2, it adjourn to meet on Friday, July 5, and from Friday, July 5, to Monday, July 8.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

IMPROVING ACTIVE DUTY PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY FOR CERTAIN AIR FORCE OFFICERS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6681) to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 1, 1961, Public Law 87–194 (75 Stat. 424), is amended by striking out the figure "1963" and inserting the figure "1964" in place thereof.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there is some degree of urgency in connection with H.R. 6681, a bill to extend for 1 year the temporary authority for the Air Force to have 4,000 additional lieutenant colonels serve on active duty.

Beginning July 1, 1963, the Air Force, unless this bill is enacted, will have to eliminate all promotions to the grade of lieutenant colonel and will have to start making plans to demote or release from active duty some 1,800 lieutenant colonels.

We granted this temporary authority in the 87th Congress and had hoped by now that the so-called Bolte legislation, which deals with grade distribution and promotion opportunities, would have been considered and passed by both Houses.

However, no action has been taken on the Bolte legislation and, as a result, this bill is necessary in order to give Air Force officers a reasonable opportunity for promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel. I might say that even with this legislation, the percentage of Air Force officers serving in the grade of lieutenant colonel compared to their total officer strength will be less than the percentage in the comparable grades in the Navy and Army.

The Committee on Armed Services unanimously supports this proposal and I urge its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAW AND ORDER

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the greatest threat to freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and all of our basic fundamental freedoms in the United States today is illegal assembly, illegal demonstrations, mob violence, and disrespect for law and order. Our Constitution and our very existence as a Nation is in jeopardy. Our English civilization is at stake. Under our American system of government, the Constitution has provided a means whereby wrong can be righted, grievances can be aired, and justice sought in an orderly legal fashion. The Constitution provides for lawmaking in a climate of caution and cool deliberation.

Every thinking American citizen today is alarmed and shocked at the growing tendency to force the passage of legislation—local, State, and National—by demonstrations, mob violence, and disrespect to peace officers. Even court orders and court decisions are being influenced by illegal demonstrations and surging mobs. No one is free to assemble or to speak in public when threatened by chanting mobs. Our dedicated, patriotic peace officers cannot preserve law and order and protect the right to assemble and freedom of speech under a barrage of brick bats and liquor bottles, particularly when the mobs feel that they are encouraged by the Federal Government. Our law enforcement agencies at the local and State levels have acted with great restraint, good judgment, and devotion to duty. They have kept cool in the face of insult, obscenity, violence, and harassment unparalleled in our history and almost unbelievable. Local policemen, chiefs of police, magistrates, local courts, sheriffs, sheriffs' deputies, State patrolmen, and State police throughout this Nation should be commended and honored for the magnificent way in which they have handled mob violence in the face of the most adverse and trying circumstances. They urgently need the backing and co-

operation of the Federal Government. Let me warn this House that disrespect for the uniform of a local policeman today can lead tomorrow to disrespect and insurrection against the men in uniform of our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, local and State law-enforcement men in every State of this Union are patriotic. They are dedicated. They often serve long hours and are called upon for extra duty. Their job is a hazardous one, and they are underpaid. The Federal Government must support these men for they are the front-line against agitation, mob violence, fascism, subversion, and communism.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Attorney General, the President, and the leaders of the Congress to have confidence in and support these local peace officers who are on the firing line in the battle to preserve freedom through law and order.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Attorney General that demonstrations in South Korea got out of hand and overthrew the National Government. Street demonstrations and mob violence overthrew the Government of Turkey. We are all familiar with the mobs of Paris. This is a sinister mob demonstration technique being adopted by the enemies of freedom all over the world. It can and will happen in the United States unless the Federal Government supports local and State governments. If this support is not soon forthcoming from the Federal Government, we can and will be on the road toward anarchy and national disaster. The Federal Government should never permit illegal demonstrations and marches upon this Capitol designed to coerce and force Congress to submit to mob rule and the law of the jungle.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 8, 1963

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the arrangements that were developed yesterday, I am wondering whether or not the majority leader can inform us as to the program for the week of July 8 at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the minority leader, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of July 8, 1963, is as follows:

Monday is District day, and there is no business.

On Monday we will call up the Consent Calendar.

In addition, on Monday we will take up suspensions. As of now there are no suspensions, but I desire to advise the House that any bills for the suspension list may be announced later. I know of none at this time.

Also on Monday we have scheduled H.R. 7139, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission. This will be taken up under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

On Tuesday we will call the Private Calendar.

Also on Tuesday, a resolution providing that H.R. 3872—Export-Import Bank Act Extension—shall be taken from the Speaker's table and sent to conference.

Also on Tuesday, H.R. 3179, judges, U.S. Court of Military Appeals. This will be taken up under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Wednesday, H.R. 134, safety standards for automobile seat belts. This will be taken up under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Thursday and the balance of the week, 1964 appropriations for the District of Columbia.

Of course, this is made with the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I add one observation with respect to the program for Tuesday. As I understand it, a rule was granted today to send the Export-Import Bank Act extension to conference. I think it might be well for the RECORD to show that in all probability a motion will be made on Tuesday to instruct the conferees with respect to backdoor spending. I make that observation at this time, Mr. Speaker, so that Members may be advised as to what may transpire on that day.

A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, because of our stubborn refusal to capitalize on the natural gambling spirit of our own people, millions of dollars continue to leave our shores every day in support of foreign-operated lotteries and other gambling activities throughout the world.

Ireland is 1 country among 77 foreign nations which utilizes a lottery not only as a compromise with its gambling problem but as a revenue-raising device as well.

Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, June 29, will be a very important day in the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans across this country because the results of the 108th Irish Hospital Sweepstakes will be announced based on the Irish Derby. The total gross receipts for this drawing come to over $15 million. I venture to estimate that at least $13 million came from the pockets of our own citizens, including some Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for our taxpayers to understand the double role played by Uncle Sam. While we assume a sanctimonious attitude about gambling, we continue to engage in a game of hypocrisy. Is it not pure and simple hypocrisy to frown on gambling and then in the same breath collect taxes on all sweepstakes and gambling winnings; impose a tax on all admissions to race tracks where betting is legal and proper; recognize gamblers by insisting that they buy a $50 tax stamp and pay 10 percent on their gross receipts?

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to be sensible and realistic about this issue. The time has come for us to remove the blinders and recognize the obvious—that the urge to gamble is normal, and a part of human nature. The time has come for us to follow the example of New Hampshire which recognized this universal, instinctive trait and decided to control and regulate it for the government's benefits and the people's welfare.

Mr. Speaker, a national lottery in the United States would not only stop the flow of gold to foreign lotteries but would pump into our own treasury over $10 billion a year in additional much needed revenue. Let us rub the luck of the Irish on our American taxpayers.

EXEMPTION FROM DUTY FOR RETURNING RESIDENTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6791) to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 472)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6791) to continue for two years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That (a) paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C., sec. 1201, par. 1798(c)(2)), is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'July 1, 1963' each place it appears in subdivisions (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1965'; and

"(2) by striking out '$200 in the case of persons arriving directly or indirectly from the Virgin Islands of the United States,' in subdivision (A) and inserting in lieu thereof '$200 in the case of persons arriving before April 1, 1964, directly or indirectly from the Virgin Islands of the United States,'.

"(b) Section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes', approved August 10, 1961 (Public Law 87-132; 75

Stat. 335), is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1963' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 31, 1964'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
THOS. J. O'BRIEN,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
HOWARD H. BAKER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
RUSSELL LONG,
GEO. A. SMATHERS,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6791) to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

In the case of any person arriving in the United States who is a returning resident thereof, paragraph 1798(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 permits certain articles to be admitted free of duty if acquired abroad, as an incident of the journey from which he is returning, for his personal or household use.

Under existing law, if such person arrives before July 1, 1963, and otherwise satisfies the requirements of the law, the value of the articles admitted free of duty may not exceed $100. However, if he arrives directly or indirectly from the Virgin Islands of the United States the $100 limit does not apply but the value of the articles admitted free of duty may not exceed $200 (not more than $100 of which shall have been acquired elsewhere than in the Virgin Islands).

If the person arrives on or after July 1, 1963, the value of the articles admitted free of duty may not exceed $200 plus (if he satisfies the requirements for the additional exemption) an additional $300.

The bill as passed by both the House and the Senate extended the termination date of the present duty exemption for returning residents from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1965. The bill as passed by the House extended the temporary $200 provision now applicable to the Virgin Islands of the United States to July 1, 1965, and included American Samoa, Wake Island, Midway Islands, Kingman Reef, Johnston Island, and the island of Guam under the provision. The Senate amendment struck out the temporary $200 provision so that a person arriving from any possession (including the Virgin Islands) of the United States would be limited to the $100 exemption.

Under the conference agreement, the temporary $200 provision is to continue to apply only to persons arriving directly or indirectly from the Virgin Islands of the United States before April 1, 1964.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
THOS. J. O'BRIEN,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
HOWARD H. BAKER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that H.R. 6791, in the form in which is passed the House of Representatives, would have continued for 2 additional years the temporary reduction, from $500 to $100, in the amount of purchases abroad that a returning resident of the United States might bring back into this country free of duty under paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. In addition, the House bill would have also extended to all of the insular possessions of the United States which are not part of the United States for tariff purposes the special provisions—allowing duty-free entry of up to $200—which now apply to purchases made in the Virgin Islands by returning American residents.

The other body amended this bill so as to strike the extra amounts which may be brought from all insular possessions, including the Virgin Islands, and provided in lieu thereof a straight $100 allowance that might be brought in free of duty from any source.

Under the agreement of the conference committee, the basic purpose of the bill with respect to continuing for 2 additional years the temporary reduction from $500 to $100 in the amount of purchases abroad that a returning resident of the United States may bring back into this country free of duty remains unchanged.

However, under the conference agreement, the duty exemption provisions which now apply to purchases made in the Virgin Islands by returning American residents will be extended through March 31, 1964. Also, under the conference agreement, this special duty exemption provision will not be extended to the other insular possessions of the United States as would have been the case under the House bill.

The conferees agreed, in connection with the extension in relation to the Virgin Islands until the close of March 31, 1964, that the operation of the provision as to the Virgin Islands should be studied by the proper Federal agencies. These agencies are to report back to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance prior to March 31, 1964. This report will concern itself with the overall effect of the $200 as it applies to the Virgin Islands. The report is expected to include but not necessarily be limited to the effect of this provision on employment and profits in the Virgin Islands, on the competitive situation of the Virgin Islands in reference to neighboring islands, on appropriations that are made on behalf of the Virgin Islands, on the economy of the Virgin Islands as to locally produced and imported items which are purchased by tourists, and any other direct or indirect effects of the operation of this provision.

It is noted that prior to the action in 1961 reducing the duty-free allowance of returning tourists from $500 to $100 generally and to $200 in the case of the Virgin Islands, that the $500 applied to the Virgin Islands. Thus, in effect the overall amount was reduced in the case of the Virgin Islands but to a lesser extent. With this study available to the two interested committees, a proper evaluation can be made as to the desirability of continuing this exemption beyond the March 31, 1964, date.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEDUCTIBILITY OF ACCRUED VACATION PAY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6246) relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 97 of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958, as amended (26 U.S.C., sec. 162 note), is amended by striking out "January 1, 1963," and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1965,".

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and I may extend our remarks in explanation of this and other bills that may be passed by unanimous consent today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6246 provides that a deduction for accrued vacation pay is not to be denied for any taxable year ending before January 1, 1965, solely because the liability for it to a specific person has not been fixed or because the liability for it to each individual cannot be computed with reasonable accuracy. However, for the corporation to obtain the deduction, the employee must have performed the qualifying service necessary under a plan or policy which provides for vacations with pay to qualified employees and the liability must be reasonably determinable with respect to the group of employees involved.

This is a continuation for 2 more years of the treatment which has been available for taxable years ending before January 1, 1963. The committee report contains a full explanation of the operation of the provision.

The Treasury Department has indicated it has no objection to this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 6246) extends for an additional 2 years the suspension of an Internal Revenue ruling which would otherwise preclude the accrual of the employer's liability for vacation pay.

The employee earns vacation pay throughout the employer's taxable year. However, if the vacation occurs after the taxable year, and the employee's rights

to a vacation, or payment in lieu thereof, might be terminated if he terminated his employment before the scheduled vacation period, the Internal Revenue ruling would preclude the accrual for tax purposes of the employer's liability for vacation pay.

The problem stems from the retroactive repeal of section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. When we adopted that provision in the 1954 code, prior rulings with respect to vacation pay were modified in order that the accrual would qualify as a deduction under section 462. The retroactive repeal of section 462 left taxpayers without any basis for accruing and deducting vacation pay. Accordingly, the Internal Revenue Service then issued a ruling which precluded such accruals, where subsequent events might defeat the employee's right to the vacation. We have been postponing the effective date of this ruling ever since.

I regret that the Treasury Department has not seen fit at this time, when we are considering a major revision of the tax laws, to propose legislative language which would permanently establish the right of the employer to accrue and deduct vacation pay. It would seem to me that after some 10 years of temporary status, a permanent rule could well have been proposed. This is particularly true since the Treasury supports this bill.

I urge favorable consideration of the bill. However, I hope that further extensions will not be necessary but that in the 2 years provided for by this extension we will bring to the House permanent legislation providing a solution to the vacation pay problem.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUED SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN ISTLE OR TAMPICO FIBER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6011) to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of Public Law 85–284 (71 Stat. 609), approved September 4, 1957 (relating to the suspension for a three-year period of the duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only in the case of articles entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, after September 4, 1957, and before September 5, 1966."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 6011, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable JACKSON BETTS, is to continue for 3 years, until September 5, 1966, the existing suspension of duty on dressed or manufactured istle or Tampico fiber.

Istle or Tampico fiber, not dressed or manufactured, has been duty free since 1930. The dressed or manufactured fiber was dutiable under a catchall provision in paragraph 1558 of the Tariff Act of 1930; temporary provision for suspension of this duty was made in 1957—Public Law 85–284—and has been in effect continuously since that time, having been extended in 1960—Public Law 86–456—to September 4, 1963.

Istle or Tampico fiber is derived from several species of the agave plant which is indigenous to Mexico. It is one of the best known and most widely used of all vegetable brush fibers. Its principal use in the United States is in the manufacture of brushes.

The situation at the time of enactment of Public Law 85–284 was that there was no domestic production of the raw fiber and an insignificant production of the dressed fiber from imported raw fiber; that good grades of raw fiber were in short supply; and that the brush industry and other importers indicated that the prices of dressed fiber had risen, with resulting increases in the cost of production and in the price of the finished product. The purpose of the suspension was to reduce the burden of the higher prices on domestic users of the fibers. The Committee on Ways and Means is convinced that conditions continue to warrant the suspension of this duty.

Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation, and the committee is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 6011) continues to September 5, 1966, the suspension of duty on manufactured istle or Tampico fiber. This is a bristle used in the making of certain types of brushes.

At the time the duty was first suspended—Public Law 85–284—there was no domestic production of raw fiber, and no significant production domestically of dressed fiber from imported raw fiber. To my knowledge, this situation has persisted so that there can be no objection to the continuance of this suspension. Accordingly, I urge your support of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUED SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON HEPTANOIC ACID

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 5712) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That heptanoic acid, provided for in paragraph 1 of the Tariff Act of 1930, shall be admitted free of duty if entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after the date of the enactment of this Act and before the expiration of the three-year period beginning on the day after such date.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 5712, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, is to continue the existing suspension of the import duty on heptanoic acid for a period of 3 years from the date of enactment. The existing suspension of duty was provided by Public Law 795 of the 86th Congress for a period of 3 years, and, in the absence of legislation, would expire on September 15, 1963.

Heptanoic acid is used in making special lubricants and brake fluids for use particularly in military aircraft. The Department of Commerce has advised that "at the present time there is no U.S. production of this acid, and U.S. consumption is dependent entirely on imports."

Heptanoic acid is classified under paragraph 1 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and is dutiable at a rate of 12½ percent ad valorem. The dollar value of present imports is low.

Favorable reports on this bill were received from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 5712) extends for an additional period of 3 years to September 15, 1966, the duty on heptanoic acid.

Heptanoic acid is used in making special lubricants and brake fluids, particularly for military aircraft. The United States is entirely dependent on imports. The dollar value of the imports is not significant. I know of no objection to the suspension of the duty for another 3 years.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUED EXEMPTION OF DUTY FOR CERTAIN TANNING EXTRACTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2675) to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 86–427 (74 Stat. 54), approved April 22, 1960, is amended by striking out "September 30, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1966".

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2675, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, is to extend for an additional 3 years, to the close of September 30, 1966, the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning—regardless of their chief use—may be imported free of duty.

The duty on tanning extracts was suspended temporarily in 1957—Public Law 85–235—and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus were similarly provided for by Public Law 86–288 and Public Law 85–645, respectively. These suspensions of duty were continued for an additional 3-year period in 1960, and in the absence of legislation would expire on September 30, 1963.

Among the considerations which led to the original suspensions of duties on these extracts were the following: The domestic tanning extract industry has been dependent upon domestic chestnut wood and bark for the domestic production of chestnut tanning extract, the only vegetable tanning material which has been produced in the United States in significant quantity. Because of the blight which virtually wiped out the chestnut trees along the Appalachian Range, domestic firms producing tanning extracts have been unable to secure raw materials. The domestic availability of tanning extracts has steadily declined and the firms which had been engaged in extract production have largely gone into other fields of activity.

The Tariff Commission has advised the Committee on Ways and Means that there is no information to indicate that the considerations which led to the previous legislation are not also pertinent at the present time, and that it is unaware of any complaints against the temporary duty-free treatment of these tanning extracts, which would be continued without substantive change by the pending bill.

Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 2675) provides for an extension of 3 years to September 30, 1966, of the period during which certain tanning extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus may be imported duty free. This continues an extension approved April 22, 1960, which expires September 30, 1963.

Your committee is advised that because of a blight which destroyed the chestnut trees along the Appalachian Range, there has been an inadequate supply of domestic extracts in the United States. Accordingly, it is necessary to resort to imports. There has been no improvement in this situation. No objection was raised to the prior duty-free treatment of these tanning extracts, and I know of no objection to the proposed extension of that treatment to September 30, 1966. Accordingly, I recommend favorable consideration of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY ON POLISHED SHEETS AND PLATES OF IRON OR STEEL

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3674) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I correctly understand that this has the effect of increasing the tariff on this particular steel?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, it does. It is done in the spirit, however, of equalizing a situation on polished sheets and plates of iron and steel which has existed since 1883.

Mr. GROSS. I think from reading the report the legislation is definitely needed. I commend the gentleman for bringing out the legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1001), be amended by striking out "sheets and plates of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated, 1¼ cents per pound" and also by striking out "other than polished, planished, or glanced, herein provided for,".

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the committee report on H.R. 3674 explains in detail the provisions of existing law which would be amended and the manner in which this bill would operate. Without going into great detail, let me summarize this entire situation by stating that the purpose of this bill is to eliminate what plainly amounts to a tariff loophole which has developed over the years basically because of historical developments in the industry.

The situation which we are seeking to change is simply this. Under the existing tariff provisions, which date back to about 1883 on this subject, it is possible for polished sheets and plates of iron or steel to be brought into the United States at a lower duty rate than unpolished sheets and plates. Clearly, this development was unintended. In the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, we corrected this situation, but the tariff schedules which are provided for in that act have not yet been put into effect because negotiations have not been completed by the President. In this bill, we are simply putting into effect immediately the provision which will be effective at such time as the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 is finally implemented by proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out here in all candor that the State Department opposed the enactment of this bill. The Committee on Ways and Means, however, notwithstanding the opposition of the State Department, concluded it advisable that this legislation be enacted immediately.

Mr. Speaker, this is a meritorious bill and should receive the favorable consideration of the House at this time.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 3674) amends the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for a uniform duty on both polished and unpolished plates of iron or steel.

The classification in the Tariff Act of 1930 provides for the entry of polished stainless steel sheets at a considerably lesser duty than sheets that are unpolished. There is no logic to this distinction.

Because of the favorable rate on unpolished stainless steel sheets, there has been a tremendous increase in imports during the past few years. Imports have jumped from 15,650 pounds having a value of $14,251 in 1959 to a current rate of more than 16,561,669 pounds having a value of more than $6.5 million. Unless this bill becomes enacted, even further increases are anticipated.

The error in classification is corrected in the tariff schedules under Public Law 87–456. However, the implementation of those schedules has been delayed. In view of the tremendous increase in imports, in obvious reliance upon a loophole in the existing classification provisions, the committee is of the opinion that corrective legislation should be enacted without further delay. I share that opinion and urge your favorable consideration of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3674 is a short bill whose urgent importance bears no relation to its brevity. Its passage is essential to correct a serious situation which is doing great harm to an important segment of our domestic steel industry. Under the Tariff Act of 1930 a duty is levied on imports of unpolished sheets and plates of alloyed steel, primarily stainless steel, of up to 14 percent ad valorem. However, by simply polishing these stainless steel sheets, importers pay only 2.9 percent ad valorem. This anomaly is due to the fact that the relevant provision in existing law predates the advent of stainless steel and was probably

designed to apply to high-tonnage carbon steel. Applied to the modern higher valued stainless steel sheets, it has led to major tariff avoidance.

As the committee report shows on page 2, U.S. imports of polished steel in 1958 were 42,952 pounds, and worth $11,020. Last year this figure had increased to 16,561,669 pounds, worth $6,555,205. Latest figures available through the Department of Commerce show that by May of this year imports had jumped to nearly 10 million pounds and worth almost $4 million. Congress recognized this rate loophole and last year the Tariff Classification Act was designed to eliminate it. However, the revised schedules provided by the bill passed last year are still in the negotiation stage and it may be quite some time before they become effective. The rate of imports has continued to skyrocket, reaching a total for the first quarter of this year approximating the total of all imports during 1962, and quicker corrective action has become imperative.

On February 11 I joined the author of the bill before the House in introducing identical legislation to secure prompt corrective action. I am very happy that the Committee on Ways and Means has given this problem the prompt attention and consideration justified by the circumstances. When we consider that the imports for the first quarter of 1963 represent a volume increase of practically 100 percent there can be no valid reason for continuing this anomaly which is permitting substantial injury to American industry. In my district alone, which is a very seriously depressed area, the passage of this bill will help save a number of jobs, and I urge the immediate adoption of this bill.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN ADDITIONAL NONPROFIT CORPORATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3297) to amend section 501(c)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations organized to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 501(c)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "September 1, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1963".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, and unanimously reported, moves forward from September 1, 1957, to January 1, 1963, the date before which certain mutual deposit guarantee funds must be organized in order to qualify for income tax exemption.

Under present law section 501(c)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, an exemption from income tax is provided for nonprofit, mutual organizations having no capital stock which are operated for the purpose of providing reserve funds for, and insurance of, shares or deposits in domestic building and loan associations, cooperative banks, or mutual savings banks. Initially this treatment was available only to organizations which had been organized before September 1, 1951. Subsequently—Public Law 86-428—this provision was extended to those organized before September 1, 1957.

These guarantee organizations provide two services for their member banks. First, they provide a deposit insurance fund to aid their members in financial difficulty and in final extremities to pay off the depositors in full if a member bank is liquidated. Second, they also maintain a liquidity fund—which may or may not be a fund separate from the deposit insurance fund—to make loans to member banks which are basically sound but short of liquid assets. The deposit insurance fund is built by premium charges and the liquidity fund deposits made with the guarantee organization. In addition, investment income is earned by the organization on both types of funds, although there is little accumulation in the case of the liquidity fund since interest generally is paid on these deposits of member banks.

As indicated by the above explanation, these guarantee organizations, although operating somewhat differently, provide essentially the same services for their members as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC), Federal corporations which are exempt from income tax on their investment earnings. Since they provide essentially the same services for their members, these organizations also have been exempted from income tax.

The attention of the Committee on Ways and Means has been called to the fact that a new guarantee organization, established to provide the same type of services as the exempt organizations referred to above, has been organized since September 1, 1957. The committee is of the opinion that the exemption should be extended to include this new organization, and the pending bill accordingly extends to January 1, 1963, the date before which such guarantee organizations must be organized in order to qualify for exemption.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1359) to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this does not increase the pay of this individual who is to be made an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is eminently correct. The Committee on Ways and Means did not report the bill until we were given that assurance, and if the gentleman will yield further, we did not report the bill until we were given the further assurance that this bill and this change would not involve one additional cent of Federal expenditure in any way.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 234 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U.S.C. 246), is amended by striking out "three Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury" and inserting in lieu thereof "four Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury".

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 1359 is to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department. Under existing law, provision is made for three Presidentially appointed Assistant Secretaries in the Department of the Treasury. The Treasury Department is one of the largest Departments of the Federal Government. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that the limitation to three Assistant Secretaries has become a distinct administrative handicap in the Treasury Department, since all of the present three Assistant Secretaries have full assignments which had made it necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to place certain other Presidential appointees who function within the Department under the general supervision of an Assistant to the Secretary, which position is not filled by a Presidential appointee. Thus, the Director of the Mint, who is a Presidential appointee, and the Chief of the U.S. Secret Service presently report to and are under the general supervision of an Assistant to the Secretary. This official, although a member of the classified civil service, must nevertheless be authorized to perform any functions relating to these bureaus which the Secretary of the Treasury himself is authorized to perform. Under the arrangement contemplated in the bill, these officials would report to the new Assistant Secretary. Moreover, the committee was advised that it has

become necessary to assign to this official, because the three Assistant Secretaries currently have more than their full share of assignments, certain responsibilities of the Treasury Department concerned with the development of the Government's broad fiscal policy.

The Committee on Ways and Means is convinced that authorization of one additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department would result in more efficient and expeditious administration within the Department. In a letter to the committee, the full text of which is incorporated in the committee report on this bill, the Secretary of the Treasury advised that the official concerned must be able to speak and act for him with authority and that:

> In his dealings with officials of other agencies, he must be able to make policy decisions on my behalf. * * * Appointment of the individual under civil service procedures does not lend itself to the type of performance required of the individual. In short, I consider a fourth Assistant Secretary essential to the efficient conduct of the business of the Treasury Department.

The Committee on Ways and Means was further advised by the Secretary of the Treasury that enactment of this legislation will result in no additional personnel in the Treasury Department and will not result in any additional costs to the Government, for the following reasons: First, the Secretary has advised that it is his intention to transfer the responsibilities mentioned to the official named to the newly created post. Second, since the salary now set by statute is the same for the Assistant to the Secretary as it will be for the Assistant Secretary which would be created, there will be no additional cost to the Government.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, this bill (S. 1359) which authorizes an additional Secretary in the Treasury Department will not involve any increase in compensation or personnel. On the contrary, it is designed solely to permit a division of the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury on a functional basis, with all four Assistants having the title of Assistant Secretary.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and I urge favorable consideration by the House.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF ORTHICON IMAGE ASSEMBLY FOR MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3272) to provide for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga., which was also reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one orthicon image assembly imported for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Georgia.

(b) If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in subsection (a) has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit, free of duty, an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga. This assembly has been delivered and installed at the Medical College Hemodynamic Center, and the bill provides for reliquidation of the entry and appropriate refund of duty in the event liquidation of the entry has become final.

Image orthicons are photo emissive camera tubes which are used in high-quality television cameras. The assembly is used in medical diagnosis, research, or education to enlarge and display X-ray views of portions of the human anatomy. The president of the Medical College of Georgia has advised that, at the time of importation of this equipment, no instrument meeting the specifications required was manufactured in the United States.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior congressional enactments, and is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 3272) provides for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for use by the Medical College of Georgia.

The orthicon image assembly provides for a projection of an X-ray image for medical diagnoses, research, and education.

At the time the instrument was purchased, no comparable instrument was manufactured in the United States. Accordingly, there is no objection to the passage of this bill, and I urge its favorable consideration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF MASS SPECTROMETER FOR STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2221) to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty the mass spectrometer (and its accompanying spare parts assortment) imported for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, California, which was entered during October 1962, pursuant to Consumption Entry 1232.

(b) If the liquidation of the entry of the articles described in subsection (a) has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

With the following committee amendment:

> On page 1, line 5, strike out "assortment" and insert in lieu thereof "assortment)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2221 is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty the mass spectrometer—and its accompanying spare parts assortment—imported for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., in October of 1962. Provision is made for reliquidation of the entry and appropriate refund of duty in the event liquidation has become final.

The instrument for which free entry would be provided by this bill is now being used in the Stauffer laboratory of the chemistry department of Stanford University for research in inorganic chemistry. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that this research is currently being sponsored by various governmental agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission, the Naval Research Laboratory, and the National Science Foundation. The committee was further informed that, at the time Stanford University determined its requirements and specifications for a mass spectrometer, no domestic instrument of equivalent scientific value or adequate performance characteristics was available from domestic sources.

In these circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is convinced that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior congressional enactments, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H.R. 2221) provides for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for use by Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. A similar bill was pending during the 87th Congress but failed of passage because of the adjournment. The spectrometer was actually imported in October 1962 and is being used by the chemistry department at Stanford University.

The committee is advised that, at the time the mass spectrometer was ordered by Stanford University, there were no domestic instruments available of an equivalent scientific value which would meet the performance characteristics required for certain research being conducted by Stanford University. Therefore, in the selection of a mass spec-

trometer, the university was forced to go abroad.

Under the circumstances, I urge favorable consideration of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY ON PANAMA HATS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it had also been our intention today to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3781) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide a uniform rate of duty for certain headwear, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. This matter is somewhat related to the situation involving polished steel sheets in that the action contemplated in the bill is also involved in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 and hence in the tariff classification and simplification program presently being negotiated by the President. But, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] called my attention to the fact earlier in the week that if this bill were called up today, he would have to, on this occasion, object to its passage. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are not calling the bill up today.

REACTION TO FAILURE TO EXTEND PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have described the serious chain reaction which was set in motion when this House decided not to extend Public Law 78. A tremendously adverse impact has been created on more citizens than the few farmers who employ bracero labor. This includes businessmen, as well as industrial and union laborers. Each day I receive letters which describe this adverse economic impact which is resulting from the recent defeat of the bracero program.

The latest letter came from Mr. Clinton Eastwood, general sales manager of Container Corp. of America, which I submit for the attention of my colleagues.

The letter referred to follows:

CONTAINER CORP. OF AMERICA,
San Francisco, Calif., June 25, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. GUBSER: We have just completed an analysis of the apparent effect the recent decision by the House of Representatives, regarding the importation of Mexican laborers, known as "braceros," will have on agriculture in California.

Just looking at the strawberry farmer situation in one little town of Gilroy, Calif., which has a population of approximately 6,000 people, the effect will be quite drastic. They have in the past, during a short bulge in the season equal to approximately 3 months, had as many as 3,400 to 3,500 bracereos. If this labor is to be excluded and it were possible to replace them with American labor, it would mean that some 3,200 families would have to move into the Gilroy area, which would suddenly flood the town of Gilroy with approximately 9,000 people, which is, of course, 50 percent more than the existing population. These 9,000 new people would have an income only during the harvest of strawberries, the rest of the year they would be on relief.

It is certainly the desire of all to eliminate unemployment in this country but not completely at the expense of upsetting our economy and moving large numbers of families into certain specific areas, thereby throwing them all on relief during the major portion of the year.

In addition to the above and looking at the State of California in its entirety, the strawberry industry alone is contributing to business the following: local field labor, over $5½ million; cartons and shipping crates, over $5 million; Railway Express charges, over $7½ million; nursery plants, over $1½ million; fertilizers, over $3½ million; containers for freezing, over $2 million; sugar for freezing, over $2 million; and inplant labor, over $1½ million.

It is estimated that if the bracero-type laborer is not available for the short picking season, which is 3 to 5 months (depending on the area) the above economic advantage to our State in this one growing area will be practically cut in half, as it will put the California strawberry growers and shippers in an undesirable competitive situation with the rest of the country. It is expected that half of the California acreage would be plowed under. The results to an industry of this nature, I am sure would not be the desire of forward thinking politicians. A whole economy can be wrecked by careless government moves. A solution should be found first for gradual transition to mechanisms before local labor should be employed, rather than a sudden shock that would cut this particular industry in half.

We have noted that some of the growers have already made moves into cooperative group organizations into Mexico. I am sure it is not your intention to move California agriculture down the coast—across the border into Mexico—but this is what you will be accomplishing if you allow this sudden decision to stand.

We here in the industry in California certainly are against any such proposal and hope that you will, as our representative, cooperate to obtain an extension to Public Law 78, and solicit all the possible votes that you can from other areas. There are really only about 3 States that are affected, which makes 47 States, that don't care and if the economy of California is hurt—that's fine with them—their business will increase which will allow them to undercut us.

This is not so catastrophic to our company as we have a Mexican-affiliated company and if our California growers decide to move to Mexico, we can certainly follow them. As a matter of fact, some have already asked us to send specifications for our product, which is shipping containers, to our Mexican plant, so that we will be in a position to supply this material in that area. Although it would help our Mexican plant, we are "American first" and would like to fight any move that drives citizens out of the country in order to continue being progressive in their own particular fields.

Please study this situation on behalf of all of us in the industry and do all possible to obtain an extension.

Thanking you for your efforts in our behalf.

Respectfully yours,

CLINTON EASTWOOD,
General Sales Manager.

P.S.—This same situation applies to many other California farm products.

HEARINGS ON BROADCAST EDITORIALIZING

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am today issuing a statement regarding the format and general objectives to be pursued in a hearing on broadcast editorializing. This hearing will begin Monday, July 15, before the Subcommittee on Communications and Power. Because of the widespread interest manifested in this matter by the public, the broadcasting industry, and Members of Congress, I wish to call to the attention of the House the opportunity our colleagues will have to present testimony and statements concerning the practice of radio and television editorialization as they have observed it. A copy of the statement I have issued today will be distributed to each Member of the House. It is as follows:

Congressman WALTER ROGERS of Texas, chair of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, announced today the format and general objectives of subcommittee hearings beginning July 15 into editorializinug practices of radio and television broadcast stations.

Congressman ROGERS said that officials of the Federal Communications Commission, representatives of broadcast industry groups and broadcast networks and stations, private citizens, and Members of Congress are expected to present voluntary testimony and statements during the hearings. Congressman ROGERS said that the length of the hearings would be determined by the extent of testimony to be received from persons who appear.

The Congressman said that the need for a careful evaluation of broadcast editorializing practices became apparent during recent hearings conducted by the subcommittee on a bill to suspend for the 1964 presidential and vice presidential election campaign the provisions of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934. The suspension of the "equal time" requirement set forth in section 315, as applied to presidential and vice presidential candidates, was approved June 19 by the House of Representatives. During the subcommittee hearings on this matter, some Members of Congress declared that in their opinion the restraint imposed by section 315 was being at times circumvented by programs devoted to an editorial expression of views held by broadcast licensees.

In some instances, it was argued, candidates for political office have become so clearly identified with specific political issues that an endorsement or criticism of the issues themselves constituted an endorsement or criticism of specific candidates.

On June 1, 1949, the Federal Communications Commission adopted a report modifying its position on the matter of broadcast editorializing. The Commission had received testimony from 49 witnesses representing the broadcasting industry and various interested organizations and members of the public. In addition, written statements of their position on the matter were placed in the record by 21 persons and organizations who were unable to appear and testify in person.

The report issued by the Commission established the guidelines under which broadcasters have exercised the editorializing privilege to this date. The Commission declared in its report that "under the American system of broadcasting, the individual licensees of radio stations have the responsibility for determining the specific program material to be broadcast over their stations. This choice, however, must be exercised in a manner consistent with the basic policy of the Congress that radio be maintained as a medium of free speech for the general public as a whole rather than as an outlet for the purely personal or private interest of the licensee. This requires that licensees devote a reasonable percentage of their broadcasting time to the discussion of public issues of interest in the community served by their stations and that such programs be designed so that the public has a reasonable opportunity to hear different opposing positions on the public issues or interest and importance in the community."

The Commission report also declared: "Licensee editorialization is but one aspect of freedom of expression by means of radio. Only insofar as it is exercised in conformity with the paramount right of the public to hear a reasonably balanced presentation of all responsible viewpoints on particular issues can such editorialization be considered to be consistent with the licensee's duty to operate in the public interest. For the licensee is a trustee impressed with the duty of preserving for the public generally radio as a medium of free expression and fair presentation."

Congressman ROGERS said that the questions involved in the subcommittee hearing include: (1) Whether the policy lines established in the Federal Communications Commission report of 1949 are being sufficiently respected by broadcast licensees, (2) Whether this is the proper policy to be established by the Government of the United States, and (3) Whether some additional safeguards should be established through legislation to insure that licensees fulfill their public obligation.

Congressman ROGERS noted that since the earliest days of radio the public responsibilities of broadcasters have been defined by the Congress, by policies established by regulatory authority, and by court decisions. He said that in 1924 the then Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover, whose department was the regulatory body for radio broadcasters, made a statement that has since generally reflected the Government's position regarding broadcast responsibility. Mr. Hoover said: "Radio communication is not to be considered merely a business carried on for private gain, for private advertising, or for entertainment of the curious. It is a public concern impressed with the public trust, to be considered primarily from the standpoint of public interest to the same extent and upon the basis of the same general principles as our other public utilities."

Congressman ROGERS observed that the broadcast licensee is "a trustee of public property—specifically the airwaves carrying the signals emanating from his transmitter—and must be responsible to that trusteeship."

The chairman said the subcommittee is expected to consider such specific proposals as may have been introduced by that time for correcting alleged abuses in existing broadcast editorialization. But he emphasized that among major purposes served by the hearings will be an essential review of existing practices so that progress can be made in providing guidelines both for the protection of the broadcaster and the public.

"One of the difficulties in dealing with the question of broadcast editorializing is a tendency to generalize," Congressman ROGERS said. "An editorial supporting the Community Chest is one thing; an editorial supporting or opposing a political candidate is quite another. In still another category are those editorials expressing positions on hotly contested political issues.

"These hearings may show that in establishing safeguards against abuses it would be necessary to differentiate among the types of editorials," the subcommittee chairman said.

Congressman ROGERS said it would be the function of the subcommittee to establish for the record the varieties of editorial activity being practiced by American broadcasters and the procedures followed by their stations in soliciting or permitting an airing of views contrary to their own.

The Congressman said he hoped testimony and statements submitted to the subcommittee would be sufficiently specific to be helpful in making these determinations.

"I hope that broadcasters who engage extensively in editorializing will come forward to testify or submit statements so that the Congress can learn the nature of their activity and the public response to it," Congressman ROGERS said.

As many Members of Congress as can be accommodated will be heard on the opening day of the hearings.

A further announcement will be made as to the order in which other witnesses will appear before the subcommittee, Congressman ROGERS said.

THE NATION'S CAPITOL: AFTER THE EAST FRONT, THE WEST FRONT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the other body yesterday passed, with amendments, H.R. 6868, the legislative appropriations bill, 1964, which had earlier been acted on by this body. An important amendment inserted by the other body repeals the permanent contract authorization which was apparently granted to the Architect of the Capitol for the "extension of the Capitol" in 84th Congress, Public Law 242, the Legislative Appropriations Act, 1956, and requires specific appropriation in a future Legislative Appropriation Act before the Capitol Architect may proceed with the so-called west front extension of the Capitol.

The language of the amendment reads:

Provided, That the proviso to the paragraph entitled "extension of the Capitol" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended, is amended by striking out "and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof."

This is an excellent amendment. Without it, the cherished Capitol of all the people of the United States could be radically altered without their elected Representatives having a chance to consider, debate, and decide what was being done.

The amendment will assure that the orderly process of parliamentary government is applied to the question of the future of our Capitol. It will assure that the collective judgment of Senators and Representatives is focused on the need to change our Capitol, and the ways of accomplishing that change. It will eliminate the recrimination and mischief that will inevitably flow from a realization that our Capitol is being radically altered without the mind of Congress ever having been applied to it.

Accordingly, I urge that the conferees from this body accept the Senate amendment, and that this House then give its ringing approval to the legislative appropriations bill, 1964, with that amendment.

Second, I urge that the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol—composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House, and the Architect of the Capitol—prior to requesting a specific appropriation relating to the west front of the Capitol in the future, ask that the American Institute of Architects appoint a committee of distinguished architects to give an advisory opinion on such a major alteration of the Capitol as the proposed west front extension. On the basis of such a request from the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, and in light of the recommendations of such a committee of distinguished and independent architects, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees could then make solid recommendations for future action and appropriation to their respective bodies. The matter can then be debated on the floors of Congress on the basis of a real sandstone-and-marble structure.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed not only many of the substantive changes made in the east front of the Capitol, but the way in which those changes were made. I had my say on this 6 years ago—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 11, pages 14622–14626. I shall not repeat here the detailed story of my distress at the east front extension.

But, in essence, tearing down the historic sandstone front of the Capitol and copying it in marble 32 feet and 6 inches to the east radically altered one of the most striking masterpieces of our national architecture. The wondrous way in which the dome seemed to cascade down to the columns of the facade is no more. The charming framing of the east front by the House and Senate wings has been substantially disturbed. The fine court between the two wings has been cut in half.

It has been proposed by consultants on the extension of the Capitol, and suggested by the Architect of the Capitol, that the House and Senate wings be extended 32 feet and 6 inches each to restore the enframing relationship. What costs and concurrent esthetic disadvantages lurk behind this proposal may readily be imagined by all who have noted the extraordinary costs, monetary and esthetic, of recent construction on Capitol Hill.

Nor was the legislative history of the east front extension such as to give the public confidence that the Congress knew what it was doing when it OK'd the project. There were no public hearings on the extension in either body. There was no debate on the floor. When, belatedly, Members of Congress, prominent architects, and countless citizens spoke out against the proposed east front extension, they did so in the face of a statutory fait accompli. It proved impossible to undo a decision already taken, to which powerful interests had committed themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I do not cite these facts to renew an old controversy, but rather to prevent a new one.

With the east front project complete, the attention of the Architect is turning again to the west front.

In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations on May 17, Mr. Stewart said:

The rate of deterioration or movement on the west side has not been lessened in any way since the work on the east front was done. I would say that now that the east front wall has been anchored, and due to oscillation of the dome, the transfer of the thrust from one arch to another which is practically impossible to determine has aggravated the condition.* * * Now, there may occur one day a ground tremor, which could cause the arch to fall * * *. I look at it this way, that the real danger comes from a tremor of any description, and nobody can tell what would happen. We have bulges in the walls and we have cracks in the walls and in the absence of any bond in the masonry, I would not dare to prophesy * * *. I am convinced that we ought to do something about the west front soon. * * * On the west side, if the west extension goes through as we propose we will add 4½ acres more (gross floor space). * * * In our studies of this project, we have made arrangements for a 1,300 seating capacity cafeteria overlooking the Mall. Also there would be a few small dining rooms. * * * Our studies reveal that our plans meet the approval of competent architects and engineers.

Mr. Campioli, the Assistant Architect, estimated the cost of the west front extension at $20 million.

This testimony by the Architect shows two things very clearly:

First. There is need for some work on the deteriorating west front.

Second. There are plans, apparently rather detailed and well advanced, for a project that would materially change and extend the west front.

Mr. Stewart's testimony did not make it clear what kinship the plans now in process have to the so-called scheme C contained in the Extension of the Capitol Report of August, 1957. Mr. Stewart said then:

In view of the fact that the extension of the east-central front under scheme B will provide only 44,930 square feet of additional space out of a total of 139,250 square feet of additional space required, the associate architects studied the advisability of making extensions on the west side of the Capitol to provide the additional needed space.

There have been no additions to the Capitol since construction of the terraces in 1884–92. With the vast growth that has occurred in the Nation, the National Capital, and the work of the Congress since that time, adequate relief from existing deficiencies in office, committee and other facilities cannot be provided simply through the extension of the east front.

It is proposed to extend the basement story of the west-central portion of the Capitol, across the courtyards, to the west terrace structure. It is also proposed to partially extend the west terrace structure and to relocate the west steps and approaches. It is further proposed to extend the original north and south wings of the west-central portion of the Capitol, and the House and Senate connections, by erection of additions to these portions of the central structure, from the first floor to the attic floor, inclusive; also, to enlarge the west portico.

The new extensions would be constructed of marble on a base of granite, in keeping with the Senate and House wings.

As the west-central section between the original north and south wings would be retained in its present location, from the first floor level up, the present sandstone facing of this portion of the building would be replaced with marble.

The proposed additions to the original north and south wings will not extend westward beyond the undisturbed central portion between the wings.

Extension of the west front will provide the following or comparable additional space: 55 office rooms and 8 committee rooms with anterooms (or, in lieu thereof, 79 office rooms); 2 document rooms; 7 storage rooms; increased accommodations for the Senate library; and increased accommodations for the Senate and House restaurants.

Scheme C provides not only additional office, committee and other related space, but also provides private unbroken circulation on each floor, from end to end of the building, for Members of Congress; more efficient underground service to the building and the kitchens; and a satisfactory solution to the problem of mechanical transportation to the floors of the House and Senate Chambers.

Under Scheme C, it is proposed to install in the west side of the Capitol, two elevators and an ascending and descending escalator in the extended House connection; and two elevators and an ascending and descending escalator in the central portion west of the rotunda. In addition, two service elevators are to be provided—one for the House and one for the Senate.

Under Scheme C, it is proposed to relocate the House and Senate restaurant facilities to the west terrace; and to provide, in lieu of present accommodations, Senate restaurant dining facilities with seating accommodations for 330 persons; House restaurant dining facilities with 440 seating accommodations; and joint restaurant facilities for 535 employees and visitors—a grand total of seating accommodations for 1,305 persons. This compares with present total seating accommodations for 622 persons.

The new restaurant facilities will be provided by relocating the west-central steps from their present position to a position on the axis of the House and Senate connections and by extending to the line of the relocated steps the central marble section of the terrace, already provided with windows, and relocating the restaurant in this part of the terrace structure. Relocation of the restaurant in this section of the terrace will provide diners with an outlook over the Mall.

The interior arrangements proposed are subject to further study and the subdivisions are indicated merely as a possible guide to the use of the space. The architects realize that assignment of space in the Capitol can only be accomplished by the Congress through its officers and committees. When a final scheme is decided upon, the architects would expect to work very closely with the Commission of Congress in charge of the project and the Architect of the Capitol, in order to arrive at the best subdivision of the interior space to fulfill the requirements of the Senate, the House, and the public.

This plan was then estimated to cost $16,625,000.

Now, whatever the structural condition of the west front is—and it may be very bad—and whatever the plans for changing the west front are—and they may be very good—Congress needs to have before it a clear plan, endorsed by the Commission, and accompanied by the recommendations of outside consulting architects.

The Capitol is preeminently the people's building. More than any other building it serves as the symbol of our entire National Government. It has an unparalleled position as a shrine and museum. Yet it is still the center of the vital legislative processes of our great Nation. It is still, through happy accidents, a beautiful building.

The people, who visit it by the thousands every day, have an extraordinary interest in what is done to it. Therefore, the people should be able to consider, discuss and inform their representatives of their views on changes in the Capitol. Every Member of Congress should have the opportunity to debate the proposed changes with the hope of actually influencing the course of events. Study and debate should take place before, not after, a decision is made.

Nowadays, outside consulting architects are used for the most mundane commercial building. Surely the national shrine deserves as much.

Happily, the American Institute of Architects has repeatedly offered its services to the Congress to provide, as a contribution to the Nation, consulting architectural services on the Nation's Capitol. The great majority of the Nation's 16,000 practicing architects belong to the American Institute of Architects. The resolution adopted by the American Institute of Architects at its annual convention in June 1955 in Minneapolis, Minn., reads as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States is currently considering a bill for the enlargement of the central section of the National Capitol in order to obtain additional committee rooms and a new dining room; and

Whereas the proposed rebuilding will involve destruction of the original form and materials of the historic and original east facade of the central block as designed and erected by William Thornton, Benjamin Henry Latrobe, and Charles Bulfinch, three of America's most gifted and famed architects; and

Whereas the proposed rebuilding would destroy the authenticity and integrity of the Nation's best known historic monument, which has become the tangible symbol of national growth and struggle from early Republic to leader of the free world; and

Whereas the provision of additional service facilities by such means constitutes an irresistible precedent for other denaturing alterations in the future: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Institute of Architects, in convention assembled, register with the Congress its strongest opposition to the alterations of the external form of the

National Capitol and urge the Congress to preserve intact the authenticity and integrity of the Capitol as the Nation's greatest historic monument; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Institute of Architects offer its services to the Congress through a committee of distinguished and unbiased architects who would advise as to how to obtain more space without sacrificing these priceless historic values.

This generous offer from the American Institute of Architects is still good. I hope that the Commission will accept it.

Back in 1956 and 1957, the Commission appointed as consulting architects on the east front extension four distinguished architects: Arthur Brown of San Francisco; Henry R. Schepley of Boston; John F. Harbeson of Philadelphia; and Gilmore D. Clarke of New York. Mr. Brown and Mr. Schepley have since died. Mr. Harbeson and Mr. Clarke are no longer available as outside consultants, since they have since been retained by the Capitol Architect, Mr. Harbeson as Associate Architect of the Rayburn Office Building, Mr. Clarke as Landscape Architect of the east front.

By providing for a fresh, unhindered study by eminent American architects, and by allowing all the people and their representatives to consider the future of their most highly prized building, we can be much more certain that the solution finally adopted will make this great building more beautiful and useful, not less.

THE HONORABLE AL F. GORMAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am filled with a deep emotion. I have just learned, belatedly, of the death of the Honorable Al F. Gorman. For many years, as an assistant corporation counsel, he had represented the interests of Chicago at the biennial sessions of the State legislature at Springfield.

During the long period of his service much legislation essential to the expanding growth of Chicago was enacted. This included enabling legislation to permit an orderly reorganization of Chicago's bankrupt local traction system. The influence of Al Gorman, his wide knowledge of urban needs and of municipal law, and the respect and affection in which he was held by the members of the general assembly, enabled him to make a contribution to the city of his birth and of his love the lasting benefit of which it is impossible to overstate. He was a great American in every sense.

My friendship with Al Gorman began when he, 37, handsome, dynamic, lovable, was the minority leader in the State Senate of Illinois over which I had the honor to preside. I have lost a close and beloved friend, the city of Chicago a native son who gave the full measure of his great ability and his dedication to her interest. Long will he be remembered.

VOTE EQUALIZATION BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, within the next year the Congress, and more particularly the House of Representatives, will probably be subjected to humiliation at the hands of the Supreme Court. The humiliation will be all the more mortifying because it will be largely deserved. I refer, of course, to the problem of equitable representation in this House for every American citizen.

The Supreme Court recently noted "probable jurisdiction" in eight cases dealing with the subject of legislative apportionment—WMCA, Inc. against Simon, Wesberry against Sanders, Maryland Committee for Fair Representation against Tawes, Davis against Mann, Wright against Rockefeller, Reynolds against Sims, Vann against Frink, and McConnell against Frink. Under normal circumstances I would consider it inappropriate to comment on cases pending in the Supreme Court, or any other court, but in this instance the Congress has not only a special interest but a special responsibility. In the hope that Congress may set its own House in order before there is occasion for judicial action I am taking this opportunity to speak out.

Any question of the propriety of congressional districts is originally within the prerogative of the States and the Congress, not the judiciary. It raises the issue of separation of powers between coequal branches of the Government. Though the Supreme Court has not yet clearly so ruled, there seem to be indications of the Court's inclination to invade this area. In the past year four of the present members of the Supreme Court expressed, by way of dicta, their belief that the Federal courts have jurisdiction over the subject matter of congressional districting and that the issue presented in such a case would not be a nonjusticiable political question. Three of the remaining Justices have not yet made known their views on the question.

In fairness to the Congress, it should be remembered that under existing law the fair distribution of seats in the House of Representatives among the several States is already guaranteed. With impartial regularity the House proceeds every 10 years to add to the representation of fast-growing States and subtracting from that of the slower ones in accordance with the impersonal dictates of the decennial census. Only last year this system was defended against attack by a Judiciary Subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] when it resisted pressure to enlarge the House after the 1960 census. In view of this past record of accomplishment the House should be willing to complete the job by providing for equal representation within the States as well as among the States.

There is no question that the Congress has the constitutional power to make this reform. Article I, section 4, of the Constitution of the United States provides that—

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for * * * Representatives shall be prescribed in each State * * * but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

This power has, however, been exercised sparingly by the Congress during the entire life of the Republic, and as a practical matter the subject has been regulated by the States.

For my own part, I wish that equitable representation in the House of Representatives would be provided now by the action of the States. In my State many citizens have been urging the Governor and the general assembly to support and enact a new plan for congressional districts that recognizes the facts of life. To date, I regret to say that no such action has been taken. Indeed, the studied indifference of local officials in a number of States to this problem has been so obvious as to lead one to despair of any timely State remedy.

As long as there was any chance that the States would act to preserve this traditional area of State legislative activity, I was reluctant to propose that the Federal Government should assume yet another role in American political life. As I have said, it now appears that there is no such likelihood. For example, in Maryland two inequitable plans for congressional districting have been rejected by the people under the referendum process. Notwithstanding this exhibition of public disapproval, the State authorities have already repeated the error and have shown no promise of any intention to adopt any other course.

Basically, the principal responsibility for the inequities that exist lie with the various State legislatures. Instead of making the periodic districting adjustments in response to population changes, far too many States have frustrated the fundamental principle of equality of representation—either through laziness or purposeful design. Many States are guilty of the usual abuses; gerrymandering or the carving of inordinately drawn district lines, the packing of single districts with opposition party voters in order to make surrounding districts safer for one's own candidates, and, in general, doing whatever possible to give the greatest political advantage to the party controlling the State legislature.

Through the years, the States have been allowed practically unbounded freedom in establishing congressional districts, but the tragic results seen to-

day leave no doubt that such responsibility can no longer be left to their uncontrolled discretion. Even among the 22 States which have redistricted since the 1960 census, 12 still contain from 1 to 9 districts which vary by more than 20 percent, greater or smaller, from the State's average district population.

Under these circumstances, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the time has now come when the Congress must act. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that unless the Congress acts promptly, its prerogative to act in its own way may, without prejudging the cases, be preempted by the action of a coordinate branch of the Federal Government.

I have, therefore, today introduced a bill intended to promote fair representation of every American citizen in the National Legislature.

Historically, the House of Representatives was intended to be the, "grand depository of the democratic principle," in that it embodied the symbol of equality of representation in our Federal Government. Even its name was chosen to be descriptive of its intended nature. Unfortunately, however, the increasing problem of malportionment of congressional districts reveals a great divergence from the original goal of true representation.

Under the Constitution, article I, section 2 provides:

> Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. The actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of the Congress * * * and within every subsequent term of 10 years.

Clearly, the Constitution calls for the apportionment of Representatives based upon the popular census. However, even a cursory examination of the census figures, as applied to the congressional districts within each State, reveals the widespread inequality between the population segments represented by the Members of the House of Representatives.

Though relative equality of population among the districts is not specifically prescribed by the Constitution, its ideal is practically basic to our concept of American democratic government. Precise equality of representation is impractical, if not impossible, but I do urge a reform which would bring about a much greater degree of equality than exists in many States today. I am convinced that Congress must take action now to solve this problem.

Employing what I consider to be the very liberal standard of a 20-percent maximum variation above or below the average population of the districts within a given State, I would like to cite just a few examples where this maximum is now exceeded. Disproportionate representation may be seen in Arizona where two of the three districts vary from the State average by more than 52 percent. In California eight districts exceed or fall short of the State average by 20 percent, one doing so by 42.4 percent. Two of Colorado's four seats are malportioned, one being 49 percent larger and one 55 percent smaller than the average. The Fifth District of Georgia contains 108 percent more people than that State's average. In my own State of Maryland, our districts vary in population from 37 percent fewer to 83 percent more than the average. My own district happens to contain 57 percent more. In 11 outsized Michigan districts, the fluctuation runs from 59 percent under to 84 percent over the average. And in Texas 16 districts exceeded the 20 percent variation, the smallest being 50 percent underpopulated to the largest containing a staggering 118 percent overpopulation. I could go on and on, but these are typical of the situations which I hope may soon be alleviated. Make no mistake, I do not intend to score the opposing political party for the creation of these conditions. Obviously, from the examples I have given, both parties are responsible, though to differing degrees. Under leave to extend my remarks, I shall submit more detailed statistics on this point.

With a view toward ameliorating these conditions, I have introduced a bill which will lend guidance to the State legislatures in their establishment of congressional districts so that we may more nearly approach our goal of a truly representative House. In brief, the bill provides that in the 89th and subsequent Congresses, no congressional district in any State shall contain a number of persons more than 20 percent greater or less than the average obtained by dividing the population of the State, as determined by the most recent decennial census, by whichever is the smaller—the number of representatives to which such State is entitled, or the number of districts then prescribed by the law of such State. Unless or until representatives are elected from conforming districts, all representatives from that State shall be elected from the State at large in subsequent general elections until all the districts within the State have been conformed.

I am fully aware of the problems that must be faced in enacting such a law, including the distastefulness of imposing limits upon State discretion in congressional districting. Yet I find no alternative to advocating such a measure in view of the lack of initiative by the States to eliminate the existing disproportionateness. Being hopeful that the legislatures will exhibit sound leadership in drawing new district boundaries, I have intentionally not included in my bill the formerly required qualities of compactness and contiguity of territory. Although many present abuses must be eliminated, I believe the geographic plotting of the districts should be done by each legislature in response to the unique circumstances which exist within that particular State. I trust there will be no long continuation of malformed districts which might necessitate further congressional pronouncement.

Certainly, the passage of this bill will be difficult, for it will be opposed by the States which will be forced to reorganize. Enactment will certainly require a true display of statemanship.

There are those among us who would restrain the Congress from taking action now in solution of this situation, hopeful that recent court decisions and the multitude of lawsuits which they have spawned will shortly force State redistricting; that is, redistricting by the State in response to court order, or redistricting by judicial decree. I take issue with this position; Congress has already waited too long to provide a fair and equitable solution to the problems of apportionment and redistricting which now exist. I urge your most serious consideration of this proposal and your support in its enactment.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following tabulation:

TABULATION OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS WHOSE POPULATIONS VARY SIGNIFICANTLY FROM THEIR STATE AVERAGES

Part I of this tabulation lists the 235 districts which vary from their respective State averages by 10 percent or more, the amount of variation, the party of the present representative from each, the party totals for each State, and the national party totals (91 Republican, 144 Democratic). Part II gives the same information for districts which vary by 15 percent or more (172: 65 Republican, 107 Democratic). Part III deals similarly with districts which vary 20 percent or more (125: 48 Republican, 77 Democratic).

The districts in part I represent 54 percent of the total in the House of Representatives. The group in part II is 39.5 percent of the House; that in part III is 28.7 percent.

Table I, below, compares the percentage of all presently held Democratic and Republican seats in the House of Representatives with the Democratic and Republican percentage of seats in the districts varying by more than 10 percent, 15 percent, and 20 percent from the State averages. Table II makes the same sort of comparison, except that it is confined to congressional districts the population of which is 10 percent or more larger than the State averages. Table III does the same for districts the population of which is 10 percent or more smaller than the State averages.

TABLE I

	Democratic		Republican	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
House seats, 88th Cong	258	59.3	177	40.7
House seats in districts with—				
10 percent or more variation	144	61.3	91	38.7
15 percent or more variation	107	62.2	65	37.8
20 percent or more variation	77	61.6	48	38.4

TABLE II

	Democratic		Republican	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
House seats, 88th Cong	258	59.3	177	40.7
House seats in districts with—				
10 percent or more plus variation	57	53.8	49	46.2
15 percent or more plus variation	40	49.4	41	50.6
20 percent of more plus variation	31	49.2	32	50.8

TABLE III

	Democratic		Republican	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
House seats, 88th Cong	258	59.3	177	40.7
House seats in districts with—				
10 percent or more minus variation	87	67.4	42	32.6
15 percent or more minus variation	67	73.6	24	26.4
20 percent or more minus variation	46	74.2	16	25.8

Congressional districts, 88th Cong., whose populations vary from State average by 10 percent or more, 15 percent or more, and 20 percent or more

PT. I. BY 10 PERCENT OR MORE

[R=Republican; D=Democratic]

State	District No.	Variation from average	Party of sitting member	State party totals
Arizona	1	+52.9	R	1 R 1 D
	3	−54.3	D	
Arkansas	1	−19.4	D	4 D
	2	+16.0	D	
	3	−25.5	D	
	4	+28.8	D	
California	1	+29.1	R	5 R 10 D
	3	+21.6	D	
	4	−24.9	D	
	5	−27.0	D	
	7	−19.4	D	
	10	+11.3	R	
	13	−11.0	R	
	16	+20.1	D	
	18	+23.4	D	
	21	−11.8	D	
	25	−10.0	D	
	27	−12.8	D	
	28	+42.4	R	
	33	+21.8	D	
	35	+14.5	R	
Colorado	1	+12.6	D	1 R 2 D
	2	+49.1	R	
	4	−55.4	D	
Connecticut	1	+36.0	D	1 R 3 D
	2	−18.8	D	
	4	+28.9	R	
	5	−37.1	D	
Florida	2	+10.4	D	6 D
	3	+23.0	D	
	4	+15.2	D	
	6	+60.3	D	
	8	−41.5	D	
	9	−42.5	D	
Georgia	2	−23.6	D	8 D
	4	−18.0	D	
	5	+108.9	D	
	6	−16.6	D	
	7	+14.3	D	
	8	−26.1	D	
	9	−31.0	D	
	10	−11.6	D	
Idaho	1	−22.9	D	2 D
	2	+22.9	D	
Illinois	2	−13.0	D	6 R 6 D
	4	+23.0	R	
	5	−16.4	D	
	6	−33.6	D	
	8	+15.1	D	
	10	+31.6	R	
	13	+19.9	R	
	14	+20.2	R	
	19	−16.6	R	
	21	−13.5	D	
	22	−11.0	R	
	24	+16.0	D	
Indiana	1	−21.1	D	5 R 2 D
	2	−15.7	R	
	3	+11.6	D	
	6	−21.3	R	
	7	−22.3	R	
	9	−31.4	R	
	11	+64.6	R	
Iowa	2	+12.3	R	2 R
	7	−10.4	R	
Kansas	1	+23.9	R	3 R
	3	−13.1	R	
	5	−14.3	R	
Kentucky	1	−19.2	D	2 R 3 D
	2	−17.6	D	
	3	+40.8	R	
	4	+10.3	D	
	5	−15.9	R	
Louisiana	1	+10.4	D	5 D
	2	+22.7	D	
	5	−15.3	D	
	6	+31.7	D	
	8	−35.2	D	

Congressional districts, 88th Cong., whose populations vary from State average by 10 percent or more, 15 percent or more, and 20 percent or more—Continued

[R=Republican; D=Democratic]

State	District No.	Variation from average	Party of sitting member	State party totals
Maryland	1	−37.2	R	2 R 4 D
	2	+60.5	D	
	3	−33.2	D	
	4	−26.9	D	
	5	+83.4	D	
	6	+57.0	R	
Massachusetts	1	−12.3	R	1 R 1 D
	9	+11.6	D	
Michigan	1	−34.8	D	8 R 6 D
	2	+11.2	R	
	4	−15.6	R	
	6	+43.5	R	
	7	+52.9	D	
	9	−28.0	R	
	10	−28.9	R	
	11	−44.6	R	
	12	−59.2	R	
	13	−38.3	D	
	15	−22.5	D	
	16	+84.8	D	
	17	+18.0	D	
	18	+58.8	R	
Minnesota	2	−12.0	R	2 R 2 D
	4	−11.3	D	
	5	−13.2	D	
	7	−11.5	R	
Mississippi	1	−16.2	D	3 D
	2	+39.7	D	
	4	−32.3	D	
Missouri	2	+17.3	R	1 R 4 D
	3	+11.2	D	
	5	−12.4	D	
	6	−10.1	D	
	10	−11.7	D	
Montana	1	−18.7	D	1 R 1 D
	2	+18.7	R	
Nebraska	1	+12.8	R	2 R
	2	−14.0	R	
New Jersey	1	+44.8	R	6 R 5 D
	2	−21.8	R	
	4	+21.4	D	
	6	+24.7	R	
	7	+37.4	R	
	9	+11.5	R	
	10	−24.8	D	
	11	−23.7	D	
	12	−10.5	R	
	13	−36.5	D	
	14	−36.9	D	
New York	7	+12.3	D	3 R 10 D
	12	+15.1	D	
	13	+11.2	D	
	14	+13.3	D	
	15	−14.3	D	
	16	−13.8	D	
	21	−11.8	D	
	22	−12.1	D	
	23	−13.6	D	
	24	−14.4	R	
	29	+10.6	D	
	30	+12.6	R	
	31	−13.7	R	
North Carolina	1	−32.9	D	1 R 5 D
	2	−15.5	D	
	4	+11.3	D	
	6	+17.6	D	
	8	+18.7	R	
	11	−12.8	D	
Ohio	1	−10.7	R	13 R 4 D
	2	+15.7	R	
	3	+72.1	R	
	4	−15.4	R	
	5	−29.4	R	
	8	−31.1	R	
	10	−35.0	R	
	11	+21.3	R	
	12	+61.8	R	
	14	+37.2	R	
	15	−44.0	D	
	16	+16.7	R	
	17	−11.0	R	
	18	−22.1	D	
	19	−10.4	D	
	20	+10.3	D	
	22	−15.2	R	
Oklahoma	1	+34.4	R	1 R 3 D
	3	−41.3	D	
	4	−35.0	D	
	5	+42.5	D	
Oregon	1	+17.1	R	1 R 2 D
	2	−40.0	D	
	3	+18.2	D	
Pennsylvania	6	+31.8	D	8 R 4 D
	7	+31.9	R	
	8	+27.9	R	
	9	+16.6	R	
	10	−10.8	R	
	11	−17.2	D	
	13	+23.2	R	
	15	−27.7	D	
	16	−15.7	R	

Congressional districts, 88th Cong., whose populations vary from State average by 10 percent or more, 15 percent or more, and 20 percent or more—Continued

[R=Republican; D=Democratic]

State	District No.	Variation from average	Party of sitting member	State party totals
Pennsylvania	21	−15.9	D	
	22	−14.6	R	
	23	−11.0	R	
South Carolina	2	+33.9	D	4 D
	3	−19.7	D	
	4	+11.9	D	
	5	−31.4	D	
South Dakota	1	+46.3	R	2 R
	2	−46.3	R	
Tennessee	1	+16.2	R	2 R 4 D
	2	+25.4	R	
	6	−18.2	D	
	7	−41.3	D	
	8	−43.6	D	
	9	+58.2	D	
Texas	1	−43.5	D	2 R 18 D
	3	−32.5	D	
	4	−50.3	D	
	5	+118.5	R	
	6	−43.0	D	
	7	−39.0	D	
	8	+30.5	D	
	9	+14.5	D	
	10	−18.8	D	
	11	−25.9	D	
	12	+23.7	D	
	13	−24.9	D	
	14	+23.8	D	
	15	+18.4	D	
	16	+31.7	R	
	17	−33.9	D	
	18	−16.5	D	
	20	+57.8	D	
	21	−39.7	D	
	22	+55.0	D	
Utah	1	−28.6	R	2 R
	2	+28.6	R	
Virginia	2	+24.6	D	1 R 4 D
	4	−11.2	D	
	5	−17.8	D	
	7	−21.1	D	
	10	+36.0	R	
Washington	2	−10.1	R	2 R 1 D
	3	−16.0	D	
	7	+25.2	R	
West Virginia	2	−11.4	D	3 D
	4	+13.4	D	
	5	−18.6	D	
Wisconsin	1	+10.0	R	4 R 4 D
	2	+34.2	D	
	3	−24.3	R	
	4	+30.4	D	
	5	+31.8	D	
	7	−19.1	R	
	9	−22.3	D	
	10	−40.1	R	
National total				91 R 144 D

PT. II. BY 15 PERCENT OR MORE

Arizona	1	+52.9	R	1 R 1 D
	3	−54.3	D	
Arkansas	1	−19.4	D	4 D
	2	+16.0	D	
	3	−25.5	D	
	4	+28.8	D	
California	1	+29.1	R	2 R 7 D
	3	+21.6	D	
	4	−24.9	D	
	5	−27.0	D	
	7	−19.4	D	
	16	+20.1	D	
	18	+23.4	D	
	28	+42.4	R	
	33	+21.8	D	
Colorado	2	+49.1	R	1 R 1 D
	4	−55.4	D	
Connecticut	1	+36.0	D	1 R 3 D
	2	−18.8	D	
	4	+28.9	R	
	5	−37.1	D	
Florida	3	+23.0	D	5 D
	4	+15.2	D	
	6	+60.3	D	
	8	−41.5	D	
	9	−42.5	D	
Georgia	2	−23.6	D	6 D
	4	−18.0	D	
	5	+108.9	D	
	6	−16.6	D	
	8	−26.1	D	
	9	−31.0	D	
Idaho	1	−22.9	D	2 D
	2	+22.9	D	
Illinois	4	+23.0	R	5 R 4 D
	5	−16.4	D	
	6	−33.6	D	
	8	+15.1	D	
	10	+31.6	R	
	13	+19.9	R	

Congressional districts, 88th Cong., whose populations vary from State average by 10 percent or more, 15 percent or more, and 20 percent or more—Continued

[R=Republican; D=Democratic]

State	District No.	Variation from average	Party of sitting member	State party totals
Illinois	14	+20.2	R	
	19	−16.6	R	
	24	+16.0	D	
Indiana	1	−21.1	D	5 R 1 D
	2	−15.7	R	
	6	−21.3	R	
	7	−22.3	R	
	9	−31.4	R	
	11	+64.6	R	
Kansas	1	+23.9	R	1 R
Kentucky	1	−19.2	D	2 R 2 D
	2	−17.6	D	
	3	+40.8	R	
	5	−15.9	R	
Louisiana	2	+22.7	D	4 D
	5	−15.3	D	
	6	+31.7	D	
	8	−35.2	D	
Maryland	1	−37.2	R	2 R 4 D
	2	+60.5	D	
	3	−33.2	D	
	4	−26.9	D	
	5	+83.4	D	
	6	+57.0	R	
Michigan	1	−34.8	D	7 R 6 D
	4	−15.6	R	
	6	+43.5	R	
	7	+52.9	D	
	9	−28.0	R	
	10	−28.9	R	
	11	−44.6	R	
	12	−59.2	R	
	13	−38.3	D	
	15	−22.5	D	
	16	+84.8	D	
	17	+18.0	D	
	18	+58.8	R	
Mississippi	1	−16.2	D	3 D
	2	+39.7	D	
	4	−32.3	D	
Missouri	2	+17.3	R	1 R
Montana	1	−18.7	D	1 R 1 D
	2	+18.7	R	
New Jersey	1	+44.8	R	4 R 5 D
	2	−21.8	R	
	4	+21.4	D	
	6	+24.7	R	
	7	+37.4	R	
	10	−24.8	D	
	11	−23.7	D	
	13	−36.5	D	
	14	−36.9	D	
New York	12	+15.1	D	1 D
North Carolina	1	−32.9	D	1 R 3 D
	2	−15.5	D	
	6	+17.6	D	
	8	+18.7	R	
Ohio	2	+15.7	R	11 R 2 D
	3	+72.1	R	
	4	−15.4	R	
	5	−29.4	R	
	8	−31.1	R	
	10	−35.0	R	
	11	+21.3	R	
	12	+61.8	R	
	14	+37.2	R	
	15	−44.0	D	
	16	+16.7	R	
	18	−22.1	D	
	22	−15.2	R	
Oklahoma	1	+34.4	R	1 R 3 D
	3	−41.3	D	
	4	−35.0	D	
	5	+42.5	D	
Oregon	1	+17.1	R	1 R 2 D
	2	−40.0	D	
	3	+18.2	D	
Pennsylvania	6	+31.8	D	5 R 4 D
	7	+31.9	R	
	8	+27.9	R	
	9	+16.6	R	
	11	−17.2	D	
	13	+23.2	R	
	15	−27.7	D	
	16	−15.7	R	
	21	−15.9	D	
South Carolina	2	+33.9	D	3 D
	3	−19.7	D	
	5	−31.4	D	
South Dakota	1	+46.3	R	2 R
	2	−46.3	R	
Tennessee	1	+16.2	R	2 R 4 D
	2	+25.4	R	
	6	−18.2	D	
	7	−41.3	D	
	8	−43.6	D	
	9	+58.2	D	

Congressional districts, 88th Cong., whose populations vary from State average by 10 percent or more, 15 percent or more, and 20 percent or more—Continued

[R=Republican; D=Democratic]

State	District No.	Variation from average	Party of sitting member	State party totals
Texas	1	−43.5	D	2 R 17 D
	3	−32.5	D	
	4	−50.3	D	
	5	+118.5	R	
	6	−43.0	D	
	7	−39.0	D	
	8	+30.5	D	
	10	−18.8	D	
	11	−25.9	D	
	12	+23.7	D	
	13	−24.9	D	
	14	+23.8	D	
	15	+18.4	D	
	16	+31.7	R	
	17	−33.9	D	
	18	−16.5	D	
	20	+57.8	D	
	21	−39.7	D	
	22	+55.0	D	
Utah	1	−28.6	R	2 R
	2	+28.6	R	
Virginia	2	+24.6	D	1 R 3 D
	5	−17.8	D	
	7	−21.1	D	
	10	+36.0	R	
Washington	3	−16.0	D	1 R 1 D
	7	+25.2	R	
West Virginia	5	−18.6	D	1 D
Wisconsin	2	+34.2	D	3 R 4 D
	3	−24.3	R	
	4	+30.4	D	
	5	+31.8	D	
	7	−19.1	R	
	9	−22.3	D	
	10	−40.1	R	
National total				65 R 107 D

PT. III. BY 20 PERCENT OR MORE

Arizona	1	+52.9	R	1 R 1 D
	3	−54.3	D	
Arkansas	3	−25.5	D	2 D
	4	+28.8	D	
California	1	+29.1	R	2 R 6 D
	3	+21.6	D	
	4	−24.9	D	
	5	−27.0	D	
	16	+20.1	D	
	18	+23.4	D	
	28	+42.4	R	
	33	+21.8	D	
Colorado	2	+49.1	R	1 R 1 D
	4	−55.4	D	
Connecticut	1	+36.0	D	1 R 2 D
	4	+28.9	R	
	5	−37.1	D	
Florida	3	+23.0	D	4 D
	6	+60.3	D	
	8	−41.5	D	
	9	−42.5	D	
Georgia	2	−23.6	D	4 D
	5	+108.9	D	
	8	−26.1	D	
	9	−31.0	D	
Idaho	1	−22.9	D	2 D
	2	+22.9	D	
Illinois	4	+23.0	R	3 R 1 D
	6	−33.6	D	
	10	+31.6	R	
	14	+20.2	R	
Indiana	1	−21.1	D	4 R 1 D
	6	−21.3	R	
	7	−22.3	R	
	9	−31.4	R	
	11	+64.6	R	
Kansas	1	+23.9	R	1 R
Kentucky	3	+40.8	R	1 R
Louisiana	2	+22.7	D	3 D
	6	+31.7	D	
	8	−35.2	D	
Maryland	1	−37.2	R	2 R 4 D
	2	+60.5	D	
	3	−33.2	D	
	4	−26.9	D	
	5	+83.4	D	
	6	+57.0	R	
Michigan	1	−34.8	D	6 R 5 D
	6	+43.5	R	
	7	+52.9	D	
	9	−28.0	R	
	10	−28.9	R	
	11	−44.6	R	
	12	−59.2	R	
	13	−38.3	D	
	15	−22.5	D	

Congressional districts, 88th Cong., whose populations vary from State average by 10 percent or more, 15 percent or more, and 20 percent or more—Continued

[R=Republican; D=Democratic

State	District No.	Variation from average	Party of sitting member	State party totals
Michigan	16	+84.8	D	
	18	+58.8	R	
Mississippi	2	+39.7	D	2 D
	4	−32.3	D	
New Jersey	1	+44.8	R	4 R 5 D
	2	−21.8	R	
	4	+21.4	D	
	6	+24.7	R	
	7	+37.4	R	
	10	−24.8	D	
	11	−23.7	D	
	13	−36.5	D	
	14	−36.9	D	
North Carolina	1	−32.9	D	1 D
Ohio	3	+72.1	R	7 R 2 D
	5	−29.4	R	
	8	−31.1	R	
	10	−35.0	R	
	11	+21.3	R	
	12	+61.8	R	
	14	+37.2	R	
	15	−44.0	D	
	18	−22.1	D	
Oklahoma	1	+34.4	R	1 R 3 D
	3	−41.3	D	
	4	−35.0	D	
	5	+42.5	D	
Oregon	2	−40.0	D	1 D
Pennsylvania	6	+31.8	D	3 R 2 D
	7	+31.9	R	
	8	+27.9	R	
	13	+23.2	R	
	15	−27.7	D	
South Carolina	2	+33.9	D	2 D
	5	−31.4	D	
South Dakota	1	+46.3	R	2 R
	2	−46.3	R	
Tennessee	2	+25.4	R	1 R 3 D
	7	−41.3	D	
	8	−43.6	D	
	9	+58.2	D	
Texas	1	−43.5	D	2 R 14 D
	3	−32.5	D	
	4	−50.3	D	
	5	+118.5	R	
	6	−43.0	D	
	7	−39.0	D	
	8	+30.5	D	
	11	−25.9	D	
	12	+23.7	D	
	13	−24.9	D	
	14	+23.8	D	
	16	+31.7	R	
	17	−33.9	D	
	20	+57.8	D	
	21	−39.7	D	
	22	+55.0	D	
Utah	1	−28.6	R	2 R
	2	+28.6	R	
Virginia	2	+24.6	D	1 R 2 D
	7	−21.1	D	
	10	+36.0	R	
Washington	7	+25.2	R	1 R
Wisconsin	2	+34.2	D	2 R 4 D
	3	−24.3	R	
	4	+30.4	D	
	5	+31.8	D	
	9	−22.3	D	
	10	−40.1	R	
National totals				48 R 77 D

NOTE.—At-large seats not included.

Sources:

Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, pt. 2 of No. 39, Sept. 28, 1962. "Congressional Redistricting."

U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Population of Congressional Districts for 88th Cong., Apr. 1, 1960." PC(S1)—26. Aug. 6, 1962.

U.S. Congress. House. "Unofficial Alphabetical List of the House of Representatives of the United States, 88th Cong."

PERCENTAGE OF REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL VOTE TO TOTAL VOTE AND PERCENTAGE OF REPUBLICAN SEATS TO TOTAL SEATS IN 1962 ELECTION, BASED UPON UNOFFICIAL RETURNS

1. ARIZONA

Republican, 170,916; 51.7 percent.
Democrat, 163,307.
Republican, 1; 33.3 percent.
Democrat, 2.

2. CALIFORNIA

Republican, 2,401,053; 47.4 percent.
Democrat, 2,665,151.
Republican, 13; 34.2 percent.
Democrat, 25.

3. COLORADO

Republican, 313,201; 52.7 percent.
Democrat, 283,097.
Republican, 2; 50 percent.
Democrat, 2.

4. CONNECTICUT

Republican, 472,538; 46 percent.
Democrat, 556,017.
Republican, 1; 20 percent.
Democrat, 4.

5. FLORIDA

Republican, 345,211; 40.1 percent (of contested seats).
Democrat, 514,487 (does not include votes of two uncontested seats).
Republican, 2; 16.7 percent (20 percent of contested seats).
Democrat, 10.

6. IDAHO

Republican, 119,905; 47.7 percent.
Democrat, 134,763.
Republican, none.
Democrat, 2.

7. ILLINOIS

Republican, 1,688,897; 50.3 percent.
Democrat, 1,670,544.
Republican, 12; 50 percent.
Democrat, 12.

8. INDIANA

Republican, 882,684; 52 percent.
Democrat, 816,826.
Republican, 7; 63.6 percent.
Democrat, 4.

9. KANSAS

Republican, 371,739; 60 percent.
Democrat, 248,287.
Republican, 5; 100 percent.
Democrat, none.

10. KENTUCKY

Republican, 190,914; 47.2 percent (of contested seats).
Democrat, 211,463 (does not include votes of four uncontested seats).
Republican, 1; 14.3 percent (33.3 percent of contested seats).
Democrat, 6.

11. MARYLAND

Republican, 315,999; 46.8 percent (of contested seats).
Democrat, 359,777 (does not include votes of 1 uncontested seat).
Republican, 2; 28.6 percent (33.3 of contested seats).
Democrat, 5.

12. MICHIGAN

Republican, 1,346,872, 48.9 percent.
Democrat, 1,406,234.
Republican, 11, 61.1 percent.
Democrat, 7.

13. MISSOURI

Republican, 498,523, 43.6 percent.
Democrat, 643,386.
Republican, 2, 20 percent.
Democrat, 8.

14. MONTANA

Republican, 117,930, 49.9 percent.
Democrat, 118,891.
Republican, 1, 50 percent.
Democrat, 1.

15. NEW JERSEY

Republican, 960,202, 49.3 percent.
Democrat, 985,729.
Republican, 8, 53.3 percent.
Democrat, 7.

16. NEW YORK

Republican, 2,646,195, 48.3 percent.
Democrat, 2,830,288 (includes Liberal Party vote).
Republican, 21, 51.2 percent.
Democrat, 20.

17. NORTH CAROLINA

Republican, 255,649, 45.5 percent (of contested seats).
Democrat, 307,311 (does not include votes of three uncontested seats).
Republican, 2, 22.2 percent (33.3 percent of contested seats).
Democrat, 9.

18. OHIO

Republican, 1,673,765, 55.7 percent.
Democrat, 1,327,346.
Republican, 17, 73.9 percent.
Democrat, 6.

19. OKLAHOMA

Republican, 242,793, 48.4 percent (of contested seats).
Democrat, 259,869 (does not include votes of two uncontested seats).
Republican, 1, 16.7 percent (25 percent of contested seats).
Democrat, 5.

20. OREGON

Republican, 286,938, 45.8 percent.
Democrat, 339,247.
Republican, 1, 25 percent.
Democrat, 3.

21. PENNSYLVANIA

Republican, 2,164,077; 50.9 percent.
Democrat, 2,090,728.
Republican, 14; 51.9 percent.
Democrat, 13.

22. SOUTH DAKOTA

Republican, 143,582; 60 percent.
Democrat, 98,396.
Republican, 2; 100 percent.
Democrat, none.

23. TENNESSEE

Republican, 215,725; 43.5 percent (of contested seats).
Democrat, 281,379 (does not include votes of one uncontested seat and one seat unreported, but does include votes of one conservative Democrat who ran as an Independent).
Republican, 3; 33.3 percent (37.5 percent of contested seats).
Democrat, 6.

24. TEXAS

Republican, 481,792; 38.6 percent.
Democrat, 768,016 (does not include vote of four uncontested seats).
Republican, 2; 91.1 percent (11.8 percent of contested seats).
Democrat, 20.

25. UTAH

Republican, 166,999; 52.7 percent.
Democrat, 150,089.
Republican, 2; 100 percent.
Democrat, none.

26. VIRGINIA

Republican, 177,969; 49.7 percent (of contested seats).
Democrat, 180,244 (does not include votes of four uncontested seats).
Republican, 2; 20 percent (33.3 percent of contested seats).
Democrat, 8.

27. WASHINGTON

Republican, 510,449; 61.3 percent.
Democrat, 323,442.
Republican, 6; 85.7 percent.
Democrat, 1.

28. WEST VIRGINIA

Republican, 268,369; 44 percent.
Democrat, 340,789.
Republican, 1; 20 percent.
Democrat, 4.

29. WISCONSIN

Republican, 613,254; 50.4 percent.
Democrat, 604,203.
Republican, 6; 60 percent.
Democrat, 4.

[From Brookings Research Report No. 12]

THE VALUE OF A VOTE IN CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS

(In March 1962, the Supreme Court handed down a landmark decision in the case of *Baker* v. *Carr*, ruling for the first time that the courts have a responsibility to see that State legislative districts are reasonably equal in population. This research report—based on "Congressional Districting: The Issue of Equal Representation," a new Brookings book by Prof. Andrew Hacker, of Cornell University—explores some implications of this decision and weighs the possibilities of reducing inequities in congressional districting in the 1960's. The findings and conclusions are those of the author and do not purport to represent the views of the Brookings Institution, its trustees, officers, or other staff members.)

When Americans vote for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives they are equal citizens in the eyes of the law—at least in theory. In fact, however, the votes they cast vary greatly in value; some are worth several times as much as others.

The population of a congressional district—or, in other words, the number of neighbors with whom a citizen must share his Representative in Congress—principally determines the weight of an individual's vote. A voter living in a lightly populated district has a weightier vote—and, therefore, is overrepresented—compared to a voter living in a heavily populated district who is underrepresented. In Michigan, for example, the 16th Congressional District has a population 4½ times that of the 12th District; yet each district has one Representative who has one vote in Congress. Indeed, in 21 of the 42 States that have more than one congressional district, a vote in the smallest district is worth at least twice as much as a vote in the largest district in the same State.

Especially significant is the fact that inequities in representation have been increasing in recent years because of shifts in population and the reluctance of States to redistrict. Since World War II tens of millions of Americans have left small towns and rural areas, moving to new jobs in urban centers. At the same time, there has been a corresponding exodus from the large cities into the rapidly growing suburbs. State legislatures have taken little notice of patterns of movement within their borders. Rural and small town lawmakers have continued to maintain majorities in the legislatures, and have shown little concern for the needs of either the cities or the suburbs.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

It is no easy task to identify an American tradition on legislative representation. There are precedents for unequal representation dating back to the colonial assemblies, as well as precedents for equality. The Constitution indicates only that each State will be allotted a certain number of Representatives according to population; it does not require that the State be divided into districts, one for each Representative. The relevant portion of section 2 of article I provides: "Representatives * * * shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers." The interpretation of many proponents of equality of representation is that just as the States are to be represented equally in the Senate so are individuals to be represented equally in the House; they argue that there would be little point in giving States Congressmen on the basis of population if the States did not redistribute Members of their delegations on the same basis.

Opinions differ regarding the intent of the framers of the Constitution, but there is a good deal of evidence that those who framed and ratified the Constitution intended that

the House of Representatives have as its constituency a public in which the votes of all citizens were of equal weight.

In the half century following ratification there was a marked tendeny toward greater political equality. Property qualifications for the vote disappeared, and during the 1830's many new State constitutions were adopted and made subject to amendment by the voters. Elections of State officials, Members of the House of Representatives, and presidential electors were made by direct vote. The democratic die was cast before the Civil War; other discriminations were removed through the 14th, 15th, 17th, and 19th amendments. While practice has lagged behind declared principles in many respects, the thrust of political development in the United States clearly has been toward political equality.

COURT DECISIONS IN THE COLEGROVE CASES

Several court cases of recent years have involved attempts to apply constitutional and political doctrines of equality to the practical issues of legislative districting. In 1946 Kenneth Colegrove, a Northwestern University political scientist, brought suit against Governor Green, of Illinois, charging that a voter in the Fifth District of Illinois, which contained only 112,116 people, had voting power worth eight times as much as his own vote in the Seventh District, which had a population of 914,053. The resulting political handicap, he claimed, was a form of arbitrary discrimination. The Supreme Court of the United States ruled against Colegrove. Associate Justice Frankfurter, in his opinion for the four-man majority, said that the judicial branch should not decide questions so clearly political in character. He suggested either of two remedies: (1) Invoke the power of Congress to regulate by law the manner in which its own Members will be elected, or (2) persuade the State legislature to create constituencies of relatively equal size; in other words, use the legislative rather than the judicial process.

The possibility of getting help from either of these sources appeared very slight, however. No Congressman has ever been denied a seat because he was elected by an undersized district, although many have obviously been so elected. As for the second alternative, Colegrove discovered greater discrepancies in the population of Illinois legislative districts than there were in congressional districts in that State. One State senate district, for example, was 16 times as large as another. There was little chance that a State legislature, itself chosen from unequal districts, would be willing to create equal-sized congressional districts.

In an effort to break this bottleneck Colegrove filed a second suit, this time against the Secretary of State of Illinois, asking the Federal courts to order the Illinois Legislature to redistrict itself more equitably. After an adverse judgment in a lower court, the Supreme Court of the United States refused to hear the case on the ground that the districting of State legislatures was outside its jurisdiction.

THE REVERSAL: BAKER *v.* CARR

On March 26, 1962, the Supreme Court reversed an earlier stand and, by a vote of six to two, decided that legislative apportionment is a proper issue for Federal courts. The case, *Baker* v. *Carr*, was an outgrowth of an unsuccessful attempt to obtain relief by following the course recommended in the first Colegrove case. Sensing that the judiciary in 1962 might be more sympathetic to the problem of urban underrepresentation than it was in 1946, a group of citizens of Nashville, Tenn., took their case to the courts.

The Supreme Court based its decision on the equal protection of the laws clause of the 14th amendment. Citizens of Tennessee who were underepresented in the State legislature could not have such equal protection because they did not have equal participation in the selection of the lawmakers.

After the decision, suits were soon filed in other States. Within 6 months about half of the States were involved in litigation growing out of *Baker* v. *Carr*. Existing State legislative apportionments were invalidated or substantially so in 14 States. Federal courts acted in five of these States: Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, Florida, and Oklahoma. State courts acted in nine states: Vermont, Rhode Island, Maryland, Michigan, Kansas, North Dakota, Mississippi, Idaho, and Pennsylvania. State constitutional provisions on legislative representation were held invalid as contrary to the 14th amendment in at least six States. More significant, the Court decisions were both effective and respected, and they encountered little opposition.

GERRYMANDERING: VARIATIONS IN POLITICAL CARTOGRAPHY

Existing inequalities are the result not only of population changes but also of gerrymandering—the manipulation of district boundaries by the dominant party in the legislature to gain maximum voting advantage. There are several ways in which gerrymandering may be carried out:

Excess votes: Party A, the party in control of the legislature, may set up one or more districts in which candidates of party B, the opposition party, will be allowed to win. However, the votes going to party B in these districts will be far in excess of the margin required for victory; and party B's candidates in other constituencies will be deprived of votes they might have otherwise put to good use. As a result, the proportion of seats won by the gerrymandering party will be greater than the proportion of votes cast for it.

Wasted votes: Party A may create districts where its own candidates win by comfortable majorities. Thus, votes going to party B's candidates in these districts are wasted in that they are cast for candidates who ultimately lose.

Through gerrymandering, therefore, party A will seek to maximize party B's excess and wasted votes and in so doing will increase the proportion of its own effective votes. Such strategies can be carried out effectively even if all congressional districts in a State are of equal size. However, party A can add to its gerrymandering gains if, in addition, it draws unequal-sized districts and concentrates its voting support in small constituencies and that of party B in larger ones.

Gerrymandering will doubtless persist, but equalization of district populations can at least set certain ground rules that will limit the impact of gerrymandering.

UNEQUAL DISTRICTS: CHARACTERISTICS AND CONSEQUENCES

A committee of the American Political Science Association has defined as "equitable" a district that has a population within a range of 85 to 115 percent of the State norm, the norm being the State's total population divided by the number of districts it contains. In 1955, on the basis of this definition, over half of the congressional districts were considered equitable, but within 5 years the number had dropped to 43 percent.

Which Americans benefit and which suffer discrimination because of unequal representation? A study of election returns over the decade of the 1950's indicates that equitable representation may be related to certain economic and political factors, but was more clearly related to a district's urban, rural, or suburban characteristics.

Urban districts were actually better represented than is commonly believed—more than 60 percent of them in the equitable range—because large cities have been losing population.

A majority of the suburban voters, on the other hand, were underrepresented. Even when redistricting takes place after a census, the suburbs, with their rapidly growing populations, often lose out because of rural domination of State legislatures.

Almost half of the rural districts were overrepresented, partly because they have been losing population, but chiefly because State legislatures deliberately gave full representation in Congress to combinations of rural counties that fell below the population norm.

The midurban group of districts—which is the largest single group and which includes all districts that are not predominantly one or the other types—had a slightly greater share of underrepresented seats and a smaller share of overrepresented ones than either the urban districts or Congress as a whole.

The problem of rural overrepresentation, then, is very great. Rural districts had 102 Congressmen though their population would have entitled them to only 86. On the other hand, the suburbs are the most seriously underrepresented. Also strongly underrepresented are urban Democrats in the South, where the rural interests retain virtually complete control of State legislatures. The conflict in congressional districting, therefore, is primarily between two American minorities—the 36 million who live in rural areas and the 29 million suburbanites.

REDISTRICTING AND THE 1960 CENSUS

In the reapportionment following the 1960 census, 9 States gained seats in the House of Representatives, 16 lost seats, while 25 kept the same total. The 25 had gained in population between 1950 and 1960, but their rate of growth had only kept pace with the national rate.

A State that loses seats as a result of reapportionment must redistrict (or elect its Congressmen at large) simply because it has too many districts for its number of Congressmen. However, a State that gains or retains the same number of Representatives can do any one of three things: It can refuse to redistrict and elect any additional Congressmen at large. It can redistrict partially, keeping some old seats and creating new ones out of the remaining territory. Or it can draw up entirely new districts.

Eighteen of the States that neither gained nor lost congressional seats in 1960 chose not to redistrict. In many cases this meant that population movements within the State were not reflected in the distribution of seats, and what is sometimes called a silent gerrymander was the result. Four States which gained one or more Congressmen elected the added members on an at-large basis. In one or two cases, this was probably only a temporary expedient, and redistricting will take place before 1970. Of the States that gained or lost Congressmen, 11 changed the districts in only a portion of their territory. Taken as a whole, these States had more equitable districts than the States that did not redistrict at all. Only nine States actually adjusted every one of their districts.

Less than half the Members of the present House of Representatives are from newly created constituencies. As the accompanying table shows, 61.8 percent of the held-over districts are inequitable in size, though only 17.8 percent of the new districts are. The evidence indicates that if a State undertakes a complete redistricting program, it is likely to do so in an equitable manner. The problem is that so few States do a thoroughgoing job of redistricting after each census.

WHAT LIES AHEAD?

The Supreme Court has said that "gross disproportion of representation" in State legislatures must be eliminated, and it may

be only a question of time before this principle will be applied to cases involving congressional districts, too. But reform will probably come slowly.

There are three possible ways of achieving remedial action:

Congressional action: No reform in districting should be expected from Congress chiefly because many Representatives now in Congress are elected, with little opposition, from small districts. They are not likely to push reforms that might jeopardize their political careers. Furthermore, if Congress passed a law requiring equitable districts, it would have to refuse to seat Members elected by inequitable ones, which would be an embarrassing step to take. Finally, many Congressmen continue to consider the creation of districts as one of the "rights" of the several States and not within the province of the Federal Government.

State action: While many States are being required to redistrict their own legislatures as a result of *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Supreme Court has been silent on congressional districts. There are no indications that the States will redistrict congressional seats until after the next census in 1970 unless they are compelled to do so. Not until the State legislatures themsleves are more truly representative and competitive will there be the kind of competition between parties and sections that can result in equitable congressional districts.

Judicial action: The Supreme Court in *Baker* v. *Carr*, which dealt only with State legislatures, made it clear that serious underrepresentation would no longer be tolerated. But as far as congressional representation is concerned, the Supreme Court's decision that the courts would not enter the field of congressional districting (in *Colegrove* v. *Green*, 1946) is still the law of the land.

However, the Supreme Court will have an opportunity soon to rule again in this area in the case of *Wesberry* v. *Vandiver*. This case, which was dismissed by a lower Federal court, deals with the size of congressional districts. A resident of the seriously underrepresented Fifth Congressional District of Atlanta, Ga., sued Governor Vandiver in an effort to obtain more equitable representation, asking that the State be compelled to redraw all districts so that each would be within 15 percent of the statewide norm.

Summary of 413 congressional districts, held over and new, 88th Cong. (Seats at large omitted)

Districts after 1960	Number of districts	Number of inequitable districts	Percentage of inequitable districts
HELD OVER DISTRICTS			
In unrestricted States (no seats gained or lost)	102	59	57.8
In unredistricted States (seats gained)	70	51	72.8
Partially redistricted States	50	27	54.0
Total held over districts	222	137	61.8
NEW DISTRICTS			
In partially redistricted States	132	26	19.7
In completely redistricted States	59	8	13.6
Total new districts	191	34	17.8
All districts	413	171	41.4

The Supreme Court may choose to reverse the lower court and order the Georgia Legislature to redistrict its congressional seats equitably; or—the more likely choice—it may tell Wesberry that since the Georgia Legislature has been directed to make itself more representative, it may be expected in turn to make congressional districts more equitable. But districting reforms would not go into effect before the 1966 congressional elections. It is not clear how representative the new legislatures will be or whether their second chambers will support equitable districting. If residents of Georgia's Fifth District do not obtain relief by legislative means, they will undoubtedly return to the courts.

The Atlanta case is a special one, however, the Fifth District of Georgia being the second largest in the country. If the Supreme Court were to decide in favor of Wesberry, it probably would do so because his district suffers a gross disproportion of representation and its residents are objects of invidious discrimination. In the whole country about 20 districts with over 600,000 inhabitants could claim some relationship to the Atlanta situation. Notable among these are Dallas, the southwest area of Detroit, the Dayton-Middletown region of Ohio, and the suburban counties of Maryland that are adjacent to Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Probably only the most glaring instances of discrimination will be done away with if *Wesberry* v. *Vandiver* replaces *Colgrove* v. *Green;* how much further the courts will go is uncertain.

Equal representation is best viewed as a question of civil rights and as such must be guaranteed under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. New York, Massachusetts, and Minnesota have shown that it is altogether practicable to draw districts of roughly equal proportion and at the same time preserve opportunities for partisan maneuvering.

As matters now stand, over 40 million Americans are being deprived of their full voice at the polls and full representation in Congress simply because they live in areas that have failed to secure political favor. Those who try to defend existing inequities are clearly on the defensive, and the principle of equal representation in the Nation's legislatures is closer to achievement than ever before.

The case for equal districts transcends partisan differences between Democrats and Republicans. The real problem is not to secure more liberal or conservative legislation, but to give full representation to all Americans. How they will want to use their power, what kind of congressmen they will elect, what will be the ultimate legislative outcome—these are important questions, but they should not affect the overriding issue of equal votes for equal citizens.

THE MAJOR DANGERS FACING AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahome [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has just demonstrated once again its abiding faith in the American traditions that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" and in time of danger it is a good idea to "keep your powder dry."

Yesterday's action approving the $47 billion appropriation bill for defense—the second largest defense appropriation bill in our peacetime history—provides a convincing answer to those shortsighted advocates of unilateral disarmament, and to fearful ones among us who believe we have already begun to cut back on defense.

For the record, the bill we have just passed is $7 billion higher than the Defense Appropriation Act of 3 years ago. During the past 2 years, this Congress has appropriated $15.5 billion more for defense than during the prior 2 years.

In the words of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman GEORGE MAHON:

> This bill represents the continuing determination of the House that we shall maintain our military superiority and expand our military capabilities, that we support a policy of strength and firmness.

Further, in the words of the same Texan:

> The program which this bill supports will make sure that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State can continue to deal at the conference table from a position of military strength.

Thus, while press accounts of this bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee have emphasized the fact that the total amount provided is nearly $2 billion below the administration requests, it would be highly inaccurate to conclude that a cut of this size has been made into the bone and muscle of American defense.

The committee has made it clear that no reduction in personnel is intended or considered necessary, in view of authority provided for transfer of funds and the deferment of some procurement items.

On the decision to defer production and procurement of some weapons, and the cutback of research and development funds by approximately $400 million, there is undoubtedly room for an honest difference of opinion. In my personal view, there is more hazard in the reduction in research and development than in any other area, and I would have preferred the full funding requested by the Defense Department.

At the same time, no honest judge can question the fact that this bill provides strong support for this country's Defense Establishment.

OUR CURRENT DEFENSE PROGRAM

The gentleman from Alabama, Congressman GEORGE ANDREWS, commenting upon the progress being made in seapower under the current program, has pointed out that we are now adding one Polaris submarine a month to our naval forces.

Nine submarines with 144 Polaris missiles are now deployed overseas and three more will join them before the year is out. The total will grow to 41 within the next few years.

Completely proven as a weapons system that is ready to fire all missiles 95 percent of the time, mobile and virtually invulnerable to enemy attack, the Polaris submarine force of the United States continues to provide a major deterrent to aggression and war.

Other major deterrents are further strengthened by this week's appropriation measure.

We continue to provide for procurement of missiles other than Polaris, for use by both the Army and the Air Force.

In the terse language of the gentleman from Texas, Congressman MAHON:

> We now have three times as many nuclear weapons on the alert as we had in 1961.

The number of tactical wings of the Air Force has increased from 16 to 21, and our airlift capacity—an area of admitted need for improvement—has increased by 60 percent since 1961.

The present program continues to provide for 16 combat-ready Army divisions, compared with 11 which we had ready for action in 1961.

Three full Marine Corps division teams, and the nucleus of a fourth, are also provided.

Of particular interest in connection with these remarks, our military buildup during the past 2 years has also provided a threefold increase in Army special forces designed to cope with limited and guerrilla-type warfare.

In summary, once again in the words of the gentleman from Texas, Congressman MAHON:

> Thus, although we all earnestly hope for peace, we are obviously stronger and better prepared for coping with a wider range of military situations than we have ever been in time of peace.

THE REASONS WHY

The basic and fundamental reason for the current defense program of the United States is found in one simple fact of life: the fact that this generation of Americans must face and deal with a threat to freedom that is far more ruthless and far more deadly than any danger we have confronted in the past.

The brain and nerve center of that danger can be found in the international Communist conspiracy, with headquarters in Moscow and Peiping, and outposts in every major capital of the world—including one stronghold located since 1959 in Havana, Cuba.

From Havana to Moscow to Peiping, there can be no doubt about the constant and common goal of that conspiracy.

From the time of Lenin to the present day it has been the same, and that goal is world domination.

In today's Communist hierarchy, Nikita Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung may disagree on tactics, but never on the long term target—Communist control of the world.

Understanding of this central truth is imperative in any careful evaluation of the dangers now confronting our country.

For, while the Russian conspirator may work and plan to accomplish conquest without war on one continent, and his Asiatic partner may pursue conquest through war on another, both are dedicated to the same basic strategy—and that is the strategy of conquest.

Within the different nations of the free world, no climate of public opinion is immune from the virus of attempted Communist conquest.

The climate of complacency and indifference can prove deadly to the friends of freedom. This is the climate in which defenses are neglected, security forgotten, and defeat almost certain. No American who loves his heritage can tolerate such a climate.

On the other extreme, the climate of fear and panic may be equally disastrous. This is the climate in which carefully planned defenses are abandoned, proven leadership distrusted, battle-tested allies rejected, and long range policies and objectives forgotten. No American who values the lessons of history can encourage this climate, either.

THE ENEMY'S STRENGTH

It is important, in the preparation of America for the test of strength in which we are now engaged, to understand and appreciate fully both the tactics of the Communist conspiracy and the Communist resources available to advance that conspiracy's objectives.

The 1961 estimate of actual Communist Party membership outside the Soviet Union—36 million in 86 countries—gives only a hard core picture of the conspiracy's strength.

Conquest—with and without war, but usually at the point of a gun—has placed more than a billion people under the Communist flag.

Khrushchev has boasted that his forces now "cover about one-fourth of the territory of the globe, have one-third of its population, and their industrial output accounts for about one-third of the total world output."

While his industrial production figures are high, his population estimates are not.

Furthermore, China's population—now in excess of 600 million—is expected to reach 1 billion by 1975.

The military power of the combined Communist countries is largely concentrated in land armies, missiles, and undersea naval forces.

Division strength of the Red bloc in Europe has been estimated at more than 150 divisions, with a high level of mechanization and mobile firepower. Additional Russian divisions not located in Europe bring this total to more than 200 divisions.

Chinese Army strength is reported in excess of 120 divisions, easily the largest single military force in Asia.

The striking power of Russia's ICBM's is a matter of keen speculation, but little doubt exists of their ability to hit targets on the North American Continent with missiles of high megaton yield.

THE SUBMARINE THREAT

A major factor in the Communist military threat is the Soviet submarine force, known to include more than 400 subs—or more than four times the number sailing for Hitler at the peak of the Battle of the Atlantic.

While the majority of these vessels are known to be diesel-powered, a growing number are nuclear-fueled and many have missile firing capability.

Vice Adm. John W. Thach, writing in U.S. Naval Proceedings, has emphasized that missiles from these subs are sufficient in range to reach America's coastal population centers.

Soviet action in lending subs to other Communist countries makes their use in limited war extremely likely, and the heavy building program now underway on Red nuclear-powered subs adds additional gravity to the seriousness of this underwater danger.

Both submarines and so-called fishing boats have figured largely in the Communist efforts to expand their Cuban beachhead in the Western Hemisphere, and an effort to establish a secret Communist submarine base in the Carribean is considered likely.

SUBVERSIVE AGGRESSION AS A WEAPON

Without in any way downgrading the military threat and the relentless economic warfare being waged by the Red bloc, an equally deadly Communist weapon in Europe, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere continues to be subversion.

Webster's definition of subversion limits it to acts "which cause overthrow or destruction."

As practiced by the Communists, subversion includes every cold war weapon from propaganda to murder.

An outstanding analysis of Red techniques in this field has been supplied by N. H. Mager and Jacques Katel, in Simon and Shuster's "Conquest Without War."

While Khrushchev is reported in this volume to have said, "It is not true that we regard violence and civil war as the only way to remake society," the words of Lenin remain to establish the true Communist ground rules:

> We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat.

And further:

> Revolutionaries who are unable to combine illegal forms of struggle with every form of illegal struggle are very poor revolutionaries.

In Latin America, in recent months, there has been little doubt of the fact that Lenin's ideas still prevail.

Murder, robbery, and arson have been the acknowledged tactics of the Castro Communists in South America.

The New York Times, in 1 week's period, reported an armed attack upon the U.S. military mission in Caracas, followed by the burning of the mission, and the attack and burning of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber warehouse in the same city.

Gustavo Machado, head of the outlawed Communist Party in Venezuela, acknowledged the burning of the Goodyear warehouse and an earlier burning of a Sears warehouse and said, "We are proud of them."

In an outstanding report upon "Castro Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere," a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported on March 14, 1963, that our Alliance for Progress is being endangered by a "Communist offensive in Latin America that is paramilitary, relying on force and violence."

Elimination of this subversive aggression, the subcommittee reported, is essential to "the success of the Alliance for Progress or any other long-range economic aid program for the region."

THE CUBAN ROLE

The Foreign Affairs Subcommittee of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] has left little doubt about the source of most aggressive subversion in Latin America.

The subcommittee declares:

From its inception the Castro regime has sought to export revolution to other countries of the hemisphere. Direct military efforts, in the form of small rebel force landings in Nicaragua, Panama, the Dominican Republic and Haiti, failed in 1959. Cuba rapidly became a base for subversion and guerrilla training, as well as propaganda campaigns aimed at the overthrow of existing Latin American governments.

The Cuban propaganda campaign, with heavy emphasis on the "Hate America" theme, is carried out by short-wave radio throughout Latin America. Radio Havana alone, in 1961, was directing 266½ hours a week of broadcasts to Latin America, with direct appeals to listeners to revolt against their governments.

The Selden subcommittee reported that from 1,000 to 1,500 Latin Americans traveled to Cuba in 1962 for ideological and paramilitary training, with increasing numbers of Communist trainees reported in 1963.

These trainees, the subcommittee said, "represent a Communist revolutionary cadre for the establishment of Castro-type regimes in the hemisphere."

The Cuban based program for revolution is so "extensive in concept and execution," in the words of the subcommittee, "as to be branded subversive 'aggression', a modern totalitarian form of warfare, against the nations of the free world."

THE WORLDWIDE DRIVE

What the Cubans are doing in Latin America, the Russians are doing in Africa, and to a lesser degree in Europe, Asia, and everywhere else a "revolutionary cadre" can be established.

Subversive aggression—a new concept of modern war—is the Khrushchev formula for "conquest without war."

No thinking American today can belittle the menacing nature of the danger thus presented.

The stakes in this struggle are total, with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in the balance.

The Communist military power, supplemented by economic warfare and subversive aggression, hangs like a sword of Damocles over all free men and women today.

The United States of America, the arsenal of democracy in World War II and the citadel of liberty in the thermonuclear age, must and shall continue to maintain a level of preparedness second to none.

On the seven seas—on land and in the air—and in space as well, the security of our Nation requires an unceasing effort to assure the excellence and readiness of armed forces capable of meeting any attack with overwhelming American power.

At the same time, it is also imperative that effective countermeasures be mounted and sustained to meet the growing menace of subversive aggression—of the conquest without war which threatens the security of many good neighbors in this hemisphere.

The recommendations of the Selden committee, ranging from economic and diplomatic measures to unilateral military action where essential to our security, should form the cornerstones for aggressive counterattack in this hemisphere.

Additional measures in the internal security field, in Latin America especially, but also in all free countries determined to resist and defeat the Communists' subversive aggression, should also be undertaken.

On this score, I have made several suggestions for changes in current hemispheric security measures, and have strongly urged increased attention to this problem within the Organization of American States.

It also seems elementary that measures which operate to improve living standards and opportunities in the critically depressed areas of the world are worthwhile in the counterattack on communism.

The exploitation of misery and distress has been a cornerstone of Communist propaganda efforts from the start, and the slogan, "to each according to his needs," is tailor-made for appeal to the underprivileged.

With more than a billion people on this earth struggling for existence on per capita incomes of less than $8 per month, the Communist conspiracy does not have to search long to find fertile soil for its insidious and misleading propaganda.

It is no accident that every Chief Executive of this Nation since World War II has recognized the need in the world for an American counteroffensive against poverty and disease in order to strengthen the forces of freedom.

Along this line, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara testified, in the early part of this year, that programs of economic assistance are "absolutely vital to winning" in the cold war.

By maintaining and building the military strength of the United States and its allies, by strengthening our forces and measures of internal security against subversion and by aggressively continuing our full economic offensive, we can and will meet and defeat modern history's most deadly threat to freedom.

Let no American, however, conclude that mere opposition to that threat is enough. Strength—and positive, constructive measures to advance our cause—are absolutely essential.

No American today is better acquainted with the Communist danger than J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI. His testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in 1961, is just as true today as it was 2 years ago:

Unfortunately, there are those who make the very mistake the Communists are so careful to avoid. These individuals concentrate on the negative rather than on the positive. They are merely against communism without being for any positive measures to eliminate the social, political, and economic frictions which the Communists are so adroit at exploiting.

These persons would do well to recall a recent lesson from history. Both Hitler and Mussolini were against communism. However, it was by what they stood for, not against, that history has judged them.

Let us make certain that America continues to meet the dangers confronting us with strength, with resolution, with positive programs, with faith in our country and its great institutions, and with equal faith in the Divine Providence who presides over the destinies of all men and all nations.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE AT GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to preface my remarks by expressing my appreciation to you for having designated me as a congressional adviser to the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva. I say that I have appreciated this because I have gained knowledge that will be of value to me in my work here. I have an entirely new concept of international conferences.

Though I had refused to attend the Conference at the instance of the State Department, I was most pleased to serve as a delegate from Congress. As a Member of this body, my loyalty is to it.

I realize full well that the field of international affairs belongs to the executive branch of our Government. I would not change that. But far too often, Congress is unable to make its position felt. We do control the purse strings. Our problem is often to have enough knowledge to adequately form an opinion of the merit of expenditures in this field. I know that I speak for all members of this body when I say that we would not deny the executive branch any justified funds that would contribute to a peaceful solution of international problems. The question as to justification is a difficult one and can only be gathered by first hand information.

I believe the Members of Congress can be of definite service to our relations with other nations by attending these international conferences. I am most pleased to report to you, Mr. Speaker,

that I was very well received by the other delegates. They seemed to have faith in our utterances. They knew that we were directly elected representatives of the people of the United States of America.

Briefly, I would review the history of the International Labor Organization. When the League of Nations was founded in 1918, a charter was given to this organization. In 1948, it became an agency of the United Nations. It is open not only to members of that organization but to any other that is accepted by a two-thirds majority of its members. One hundred and eight member nations were represented at the immediate conference. The ILO charter states that it aims to promote social justice; improve labor conditions and living standards; and promote economic stability. At the conference, labor standards are formulated and adopted. However the member nations are at liberty to ratify them or not as they see fit.

A permanent office is maintained as is a permanent secretariat. This is under the guidance of Mr. David Morse, an American.

The effectiveness of the ILO can be questioned when one considers that even the resolution forbidding forced labor has only been ratified by one-half the member nations.

The United States provides 25 percent of the total budget of the ILO. Our contribution has amounted to the sum of $5,243,136 for the past 2 years. The U.S. delegation to this year's conference consisted of the Government representatives headed by the Honorable George L. P. Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs, Department of Labor, and Mr. George P. Delaney, special assistant to the Secretary of State, Department of State.

The employers' representatives headed by Mr. Richard Wagner, chairman of the board, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The workers representatives were headed by Mr. Rudolph Faupl, international representative of the International Association of Machinists.

The men acting as advisers to these distinguished officials were without exception men of great ability. They were all concerned with giving the United States excellent representation. They are listed here:

Alternate delegate: Mr. John F. Skillman, special assistant to the Secretary, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Congressional advisers: Hon ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., House of Representatives; Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES, House of Representatives.

Alternate congressional advisers: Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., House of Represenatives; JAMES ROOSEVELT, House of Representatives.

Senior adviser: Hon. Roger W. Tubby (liaison—Far East), U.S. representative to the U.S. mission to the European office of the U.N. and other international organizations, Geneva, Switzerland.

General advisers: Mr. Richard Conn, information officer (at Department of Labor expense), Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor; Mr. Dale Good, political officer (with special emphasis on the governing body elections), Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

Area liaison advisers: Mr. William M. Steen (liaison—Africa), African area specialist U.S. Department of Labor; Mr. John L. Hagan (secretary to the delegation and liaison with Latin America), Office of International Conferences, U.S. Department of State; Mr. Irvin Lippe, attaché (liaison—Europe), U.S. mission, Geneva, Switzerland; Mr. Harold D. Snell, labor attaché (liaison—Near and Middle East), Beirut, Lebanon.

Technical advisers:

Application of conventions and executive officer: Mr. John E. Lawyer, Associate Director, Office of International Organizations, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor.

Prohibition of sale, hire, and use of inadequately guarded machinery (second discussion): Mr. Morris B. Wallach, international safety consultant, Division of International Cooperation, Bureau of Labor Standards, U.S. Department of Labor.

Termination of employment at the initiative of the employer (second discussion): Mr. Harry Douty, Assistant Commissioner for Wages and Industrial Relations, Office of Wages, Industrial Relations and Prices, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

Benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases (first discussion): Mr. Donald L. Ream, Chief, Workmen's Compensation Branch, Division of State Services, Bureau of Labor Standards, U.S. Department of Labor.

Hygiene in shops and offices (first discussion): Mr. John P. O'Neill, industrial hygienist, Division of Programing and Training, Bureau of Labor Standards, U.S. Department of Labor.

Representing the employers of the United States:

Advisers: Mr. John E. Branch, Wilson, Branch & Barwick, Rhodes-Haverty Building, Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. Malcolm L. Denise, vice president, labor relations, the Ford Motor Co., the American Road, Dearborn, Mich.; Mr. Richard P. Doherty, president, Television-Radio Management Corp., Washington, D.C.; Mr. Edwin R. Niehaus, director, employee relations, the Great Western Sugar Co., Denver, Colo.; Mr. George J. Pantos, labor attorney, labor relations and legal department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C.; and Mr. William G. Van Meter, program development general manager, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Representing the workers of the United States:

Advisers: Mr. Cornelius J. Haggerty, president, Building & Construction Trades Department, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C.; Mr. Joseph D. Keenan, secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Washington, D.C.; Mr. George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C.

Mr. William J. Pachler, president, Utility Workers Union of America, Washington, D.C.; Mr. Jacob S. Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York, N.Y.; Mr. Bert Seidman (at AFL–CIO expense), European economic representative, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Paris, France; and Mr. David Sullivan, president, Building Service Employees' International Union, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state our delegates representing the Government, the employers, and the workers were at full freedom to vote on particular measures according to their beliefs on the subject. It is not unusual to find the delegates of many of the nations in disagreement on specific measures. That is why the International Labor Organization was granted delegates representing government, employers, and workers.

I was interested in investigating the position of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in this matter. They, too, had delegates representing Government, employers, and workers. My research could discover no occasion when their employer and worker delegates had differed in the slightest degree from the position of their Government delegate. This condition also prevailed with the Soviet satellite nations. Include Cuba amongst these satellite nations. Certainly their employer delegations have no justification for meeting with the representatives of the employer groups of the free nations. The free employers did boycott them one year but have resumed conferences with them. The International Labor Organization's Appeal Board has given them their status. It is difficult for me to see any good reason for their action.

I can but believe that the Soviet Union is a member of this organization for the sole purpose of creating a false image to the world. The image being one that would have all people believe that the Soviet Union has democratic consideration for its people. Certainly this nefarious propaganda should be exposed for what it really is—slavery under the guise of a communistic state.

Mr. Speaker, a crisis occurred during this year's meetings of the International Labor Organization. Thirty-two delegations representing the African nations rose in protest at the presence of the South African delegation. They, joined by Arab countries, left the Conference. At this time, I will enter in the RECORD the speech made by the Secretary General of the Conference, Mr. David Morse:

I have, during 15 years, come to this rostrum to defend many interests in the interest of maintaining the universality and the strength of our organization. Today, I come again in what is perhaps my most difficult intervention, but one which must be made, since ours is a responsible organization dedicated to the struggle for peace, dedicated to improving the welfare of all men. I owe it to my member states to set the record straight and to give you the objective facts in the situation, because we are now part of the historical process, and it is important, in the writing of history, that the truth be stated so that those who follow us can benefit from our own experiences.

I rise to speak because I was told yesterday by a committee officially designated to represent the African group that they had not yet prepared an agreed declaration and that before they made a declaration they would inform the Secretary General—the Director General of this organization—who, after all, is the trustee of its constitution and its welfare. I have not yet been so informed, and I am surprised that my first notice is your statement this morning, Mr. Johnson, from this rostrum.

Secondly, I must put the record straight. Mr. Johnson has resigned as president of the

Conference, and, of course, it will be necessary to elect a new president. In his resignation Mr. Johnson sent me the following note: "DIRECTOR GENERAL, ILO:

"I regret initiating a move that may bring strain and add to the already heavy work of the congress. Please accept my resignation as president of the 47th session of the ILO. It is inevitable that I should take this step, and I wish the congress every luck.

"J. M. JOHNSON."

This was delivered to me during the latter part of the morning of Saturday. It has been officially acted upon by the officers of the Conference. The selection committee was notified yesterday. Mr. Johnson is, of course, as he himself indicated, no longer president of the Conference.

Now I want you to be good enough, all of you, to sit back and hear me out. This is not easy, but I have got to do it, and I beg of you your courtesy and your patience because I speak to you from the very best of motives and from the bottom of my heart.

This Conference and this organization have been living through very difficult days. The situation has developed since last Wednesday, when a protest was made by the African delegates concerning the right of the employers' delegate from the Republic of South Africa to speak in the discussion on the Director General's report. It continued last Friday when, as you know, on the ruling of the Chair, the employers' delegate from South Africa made his statement and a number of delegates thereupon left the hall and, as you know, there was a considerable and noisy demonstration.

Since then plenary sittings of the Conference have been suspended. There have been a series of discussions and negotiations outside this hall in an attempt to find a way out of the impasse in which the Conference found itself. These were initiated by me, because of my responsibility as Secretary-General of the Conference and on the specific authority given to me by the Selection Committee of the Conference last Wednesday evening to carry out consultations with a view to a resolution of the difficulty. These consultations have, in an atmosphere of tension, been accompanied by various rumors. There have also been certain statements to the press, and, as I said earlier, I must set the record straight so that all delegates may have a correct understanding of what has transpired and so that the work of this Conference may continue.

First let me say that fundamental issues touching the very structure of civilization and human dignity are involved in this situation. There is the issue of discrimination, of a racial policy which has been condemned by a resolution adopted, without opposition, by this Conference in 1961. Also there is the issue of freedom of speech for duly accredited delegates—even for those who may hold condemned opinions.

It has been suggested that the ILO and its executive officers have approached this problem from too legalistic and procedural a standpoint and have not considered it from its moral aspects. I must be the first to dispel this idea. The ILO has always been alive to the moral aspect. Indeed, that is the foundation of its law. The ILO, alone among all the international organizations, has been persistent and able to give substance to the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, through a number of binding international conventions in the human rights field, dealing with freedom of association, abolition of forced labor, and the elimination of discrimination in employment.

Furthermore, the governing body has established a standing committee that will deal on a practical basis with the issue of discrimination. Also, the ILO has been dealing—more persistently, I submit, than any other international organization—with the basic issues of human rights and discrimination which are involved in the South African question. And may I remind you that it has been dealing with them as moral issues, not legalistic issues, and in practical ways.

I make this clear so as to stress that the ILO, its officers and its Director General have not approached and cannot approach this question in a narrow, limited, procedural way. Nevertheless I say at the same time that the Organization cannot afford to compromise its constitutional position by ill-considered action. The basic constitutional law of this Organization is the mandate it has received. And from whom has it received this mandate? It has received it from the soverign states which make up the ILO—all of you here who represent your governments. If this is violated the very existence of the ILO as an international organization is violated, and it is through. Any breach of this constitutional law would open the way for arbitrary, vicious rule which today may be turned against one party but tomorrow will be turned against another party.

I, as Director General, I tell you this, will never, never be a consenting party to any action—any supposed solution to a difficulty—which would undermine the foundations of law and of confidence on which the ILO rests.

Accordingly I considered it my duty—my solemn duty—to point out to the African delegates courses of action which would be legally possible and which might at the same time be substantially more effective means of pursuing their legitimate aims than either the sort of demonstration we had last Friday or a total withdrawal of the African delegations from the work of the Conference.

One of my difficulties during this phase, which I must point out to the Conference, was in maintaining contact with the African delegations. They were meeting—the government, employer, and worker delegates from Africa together—at various times during Saturday, Sunday, and yesterday. Several times I sent messages offering to speak with this meeting, but I was informed each time that it was not necessary. Finally, at my request to be heard I was informed that a delegation of 12, composed from the 3 groups, had been appointed to meet with me yesterday at 9 a.m. This delegation's spokesman made it clear that it was not empowered to discuss with me, but only to hear what I had to say and report back to the full meeting of African delegates.

Thus I explained to this delegation four points—I want to tell you about these four points—outlining a composite of measures that were open to the African delegations, and these were as follows:

First, the African delegations might have come to this session of the Conference with a challenge to the credentials of the South African Government delegation and, in view especially of the 1961 resolution, this could have been a basis for excluding the delegation from participating at this session. The African delegations could, however, take action to challenge these credentials at the next session if they so desired.

Second, a resolution could be submitted to this session of the Conference under the existing urgency procedure which would put this Conference clearly on record against the policy of apartheid. In addition, this resolution could ask the United Nations to become seized with this problem and to determine a policy to be adopted by the entire United Nations family on the issue of apartheid. This resolution could also request the Security Council of the United Nations to deal with the issue of apartheid on an urgent basis at its next session, which will be next month, July 1963.

Third, I stated that I would be prepared personally, in my capacity as Secretary General of the Conference and Director General of the ILO, to meet with the Secretary General of the United Nations in July, upon the close of this session, in order to clarify and put personally to the Secretary General, U Thant, such views as this Conference might decide to embody in a resolution at this session. This would insure that resolutions passed by the ILO and by the United Nations are fully coordinated and that the Secretary General is in possession of all the elements for his presentation to the Security Council when it meets in July.

Fourth, the African group could decide to undertake concerted action in the governing body of the ILO and in the governing bodies of all other international organizations, and in the United Nations itself, to obtain the specific amendment of the constitution of the ILO, the constitutions of all other international organizations, and the constitution of the United Nations itself, which would state specifically that the policy of apartheid was fundamentally contrary to the constitutions of all these bodies and that any nation practicing this policy cannot be a member of the United Nations or any of the organizations comprising the United Nations family.

In making these points to the delegation which met with me I reiterated my willingness and my desire to meet with the whole assembly of African delegations, to explain the position to them as I saw it and to discuss any question with them. The delegation's spokesman indicated, however, that they would report to the whole meeting and would inform me in due course of its wishes.

That was yesterday morning. Early in the afternoon I heard unofficial reports that the meeting of African delegates had concluded. The press, however, had word that a declaration had been adopted and that it was to be read to the plenary sitting. There was even a text of such a declaration in the hands of some journalists.

Some of the members of the delegation from the African meeting came back to see me yesterday afternoon. Their spokesman then informed me that the meeting had decided that the African delegations would cease participating in the work of the session. At the same time, it was made clear that this decision was subject to change in the light of developments that might take place—presumably any further negotiations that might lead to a different situation.

I turned to these gentlemen and I asked these spokesmen for the African delegates whether they could clarify the reports I had received concerning a declaration to be made on their behalf. In reply I was informed that the information I had received, and that I had heard, was completely inaccurate. No declaration had been approved by the delegations. Furthermore, I was assured that, as Secretary General of the Conference, I would be informed of any such declaration before it was made to the Conference. I told the Selection Committee last evening, for the record, on my word as Secretary General of this Conference, that I was informed that there was no declaration, that no declaration had been agreed and that I was not seized of one; because I believed.

Meanwhile, as I mentioned, a statement was circulated to the press purporting to be a declaration of the African delegations to the Conference. Many of you will have read the substance of this so-called declaration in today's newspapers. I have. I refer to this now as a matter of privilege because this text contains certain allegations concerning

which the facts must be made clear also. It concerns the person who presided over the sitting of the Conference last Friday, Mr. Faupl, the workers' vice president of the Conference. Let me read the text which was given to the press:

"Considering the personal and anticonstitutional action of the vice president, Mr. Faupl, president of the 11th meeting, and the deplorable manner with which the representative of the Republic of South Africa was imposed on the members of the Conference in violation of the 1961 resolution decides as a protest to abstain from participating in the meeting."

What I am going to tell you now I also told the spokesman representing the African delegations and, subsequently, the selection committee. It is this: that Mr. Faupl, when he presided at the sitting of the Conference where this problem came up, was presiding after a meeting of all the officers of the Conference at which it was agreed by all the officers of the Conference that he should take the chair so that the business of the Conference could proceed. The situation was that the government vice president had already had the chair and he agreed that he should not take the chair on this occasion. It was his own view that, as he had had it, it was the next person's turn. The next person was the employers' vice president. The employers' vice president felt that, in view of the fact that he would be called upon to rule in a case involving an employer, it might be considered strange, or that his ruling might even be impugned. So, in the circumstances, it was suggested that the next person in turn take the chair; and that happened to be Mr. Faupl.

Now, Mr. Faupl stated that he did not want to take the chair; he stated that he had voted in favor of the resolution on South Africa; he stated that from the bottom of his toes he was against the whole policy of apartheid; he stated that his whole career in his country had been spent in fighting racialism and he did not want to have to be placed in the position of ruling in a case which ran against his own conscience when it came to the elements of this issue. This was the discussion which took place among the officers of this Conference. But he was prevailed upon by his colleagues, by all the officers of this Conference, to do his duty, and he said: "I will accept that; after all, it is true, I have been elected; this is an honor, being vice president, which has been conferred upon the workers. But I accept only in all these circumstances, in the interests of the organization and in the interests of complying with the constitutional requirements of the job at this session, and only on this condition, that all the officers of the Conference agree that I shall rule in this matter that the South African delegate has the right to speak." That was his position.

The government vice president then indicated that he would like to suggest an amendment to what Mr. Faupl had proposed, his amendment being that when Mr. Faupl ruled it should be very clear that he was ruling that all delegates had the right to speak, not just the delegate of South Africa, so that it was clear that we were talking about a principle which really was basic to the whole issue of freedom of speech. That, of course, was accepted unanimously by the officers, including Mr. Johnson, and it was on that basis and on behalf of all the officers that Mr. Faupl came to this rostrum and agreed to preside.

We then went back to the Selection Committee, all the officers of the Conference went to the Selection Committee, including Mr. Johnson, and I reported to the committee that the acting President would proceed in the Conference on this agreed basis.

Now, there are many other aspects of this problem that I could go into, but I thought I ought to make it clear that any public insinuation of this character in this matter concerning Mr. Rudi Faupl and concerning the manner in which he presided must be publicly, irrevocably and clearly denied. There must not be any misunderstanding about the manner in which any officer of this Conference has discharged his responsibilities. I do not want to go further into this case, but I think it important that this particular point be made.

Now let me revert to the story of the negotiations and add that on several occasions during the last few days I have been in contact with the government delegation of the Republic of South Africa in order to ascertain, in line with the resolution of 1961, whether that delegation would be prepared to withdraw from the Conference. I was given to understand that the Government of South Africa had decided, as a matter of policy, not to leave.

So much, then, for the record of the discussions. Where does this leave us? Let me recapitulate the position as I see it and let me tell you what I think should be the course of action for our Conference.

This Conference at its 1961 session adopted a resolution condemning the racial policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and advising the Republic of South Africa to withdraw from membership of the ILO.

The Government of South Africa has not complied with this advice, nor has its delegation consented to withdraw from this session of the Conference, and there is no provision in the ILO constitution for the expulsion of a member State.

In the face of this situation, Mr. Johnson of Nigeria, who was the mover of the 1961 resolution, as he stated this morning, resigned as president of the session, and the African delegations, as I was told yesterday, have decided to participate no further in its work.

So far, the situation would seem to be entirely negative. However, there are, in addition, more recent factors which put the situation in a different light.

The first of these is the continuing determination of the majority of delegates that the constructive work of the ILO in fulfillment of its basic objectives should not be allowed to be paralyzed. Accordingly, a new president of the Conference will be elected and under his guidance the basic work, our search for peace, based upon social justice, can continue its way to fruition.

And, in addition, a resolution has been submitted to me under the urgency provision of the standing orders, and the officers of the Conference are now seized of it. This draft resolution would reiterate the condemnation of apartheid of the 1961 resolution and refer the situation created by South Africa's noncompliance with that resolution as a matter of urgency to the United Nations. It would request the United Nations to consider the situation in relation to South Africa's continued participation as a member of the United Nations and to report action taken to the ILO. This draft resolution, which has been presented by the government delegate of Panama, thus takes up one of the suggestions I made to the African delegations. Other points could be taken up in the governing body.

Let me say, in concluding this assessment of the situation, that the ILO has had to face very grave crises in its recent history. I have been through them all, and I believe myself that from each test we have emerged strengthened, and I believe that we will do so again. There are two reasons for this: As an organization, we have never wavered, we never will waver, in our basic moral purposes; and we have never adopted, and we shall never adopt, arbitrary methods.

In 1954, when issues of a different character, but equally as grave as those which confront us today, were raised, issues concerning the right of the Soviet Union to participate fully in the work of the ILO, I recalled to the Conference that the rule of law, due process of law tempered by reason and equity, was the essence of our tradition and civilization.

Let me quote what I said then. "Yet we can never afford to take a tradition like ours for granted. The rule of law can be destroyed by any acquiescence in a violation of law. A habit of reasonable compromise can be undermined by emotional intransigence. Whatever future course this Organization may take, any abandonment of our tradition, any resort to unconstitutional means to overcome a problem in defiance of due process of law, can only be to our loss. It would drain away our constitutional strength.

"And this is an issue, let me emphasize, which does not affect us, the ILO, alone. With great care we have all helped to build a framework for international cooperation through the United Nations family organizations. Any move to break away from this acquired habit by resorting to the use of power alone, no matter what the seeming advantages, no matter what the provocation, would not only threaten the ILO, it would be a setback for the United Nations. Each of us here must continue the work of our predecessors, to nurture prudently the growth of a civilized community of nations."

That is what I said in 1954, and which I feel bound to recall in the light of our present very different circumstances, because the principle I tried to express, the feeble manner in which I tried to put my views across on this particular concept, is I believe of lasting and real validity. These are words, but there is truth in them, and I believe that if we adhere to the law it will reinforce the moral purpose of the ILO in its struggle against racial discrimination and for universal recognition of human dignity. Without law there can be no respect for dignity, no civilized recognition of equal rights and equal opportunities. The infraction of law only creates the basis for discrimination. So we must fight discrimination, but we must fight it with truth and we must fight it with the dignity that comes from truth.

My friends, you do not have to tell me about racial discrimination; I need no lessons on racial discrimination. Racial discrimination is the enemy of the civilized world community. It is a challenge to the existence of a world community, and so it is a challenge to world peace, it is a challenge to world order. We must fight this discrimination, we must fight this enemy, but we must fight it with methods which strengthen the foundations of world order. We must—I urge upon you, I pray you—engage this enemy effectively. This cannot be done by quitting the Conference, by sitting in the halls.

That is why I regret the decision of which I was informed yesterday that the African delegations were planning to take no further part in this session of the Conference. I think this is an unfortunate decision. I think it is a very unwise one. I would prefer to see Africans stay and fight on this issue, fight under the rules of law which are open to them, and show the world how men can meet a challenge and master it, and master it with the power of truth and dignity. I know from my own struggle with fascism through 5 years of war that you can-

not engage the enemy when you retreat from the field of battle.

This issue of apartheid is one by which the United Nations and the other specialized agencies, as well as the ILO, are now challenged. I believe that this Conference should take a decisive step in responding to the challenge, in doing so in a way whereby the United Nations and the ILO, with the other organizations, work out together a common policy, a common action, combining their force and their effectiveness. Whether this is done depends upon the delegates present here—depends in large measure upon the African delegates.

It has been said, and it has been mentioned in the press, that some people would be ready to destroy the ILO as a protest against South Africa. Let me say this. They will not. They cannot destroy the ILO; they do not have it in their power to destroy the ILO. The ILO is too firmly rooted in the movements of workers everywhere in the world toward fuller freedom and a social order which is more just and equitable, and in the struggle of the peoples of emerging nations for a better way of life. Those who talk this way cannot destroy the ILO, but they can limit the effectiveness with which the ILO works to achieve what they themselves want. They can, if the passion of the moment so dictates, reject the weapon which the ILO can be in the struggle against discrimination.

And this is the question with which this Conference is now squarely faced. Do we lay down our weapons? Do we abandon the field of battle? De we sabotage the foundations of a civilized world community in our haste to leave? Or do we, on the contrary, go forward together to engage in the struggle and to triumph over injustice and oppression, to triumph over poverty and discrimination? That is the decision before this Conference.

Mr. Speaker, this speech was made on June 18, 1963.

That the Members of the House might be informed of the position of our Government on this problem, I do also enter into the RECORD the speech of our Government delegate, the Honorable George L-P. Weaver:

I recognize the fact that this has been a long and at times impassioned debate, one that I believe quite often has strayed from the central question and the central points at issue.

I remarked that at the outset each speaker during this long debate has seen fit (and I think properly so) to state his position on one of the central issues, and I think the context of this debate clearly illuminates that there are two basic issues involved. There have been divergencies, as could normally be expected in an issue which has within itself the possibilities for so much passion. We have listened to observations that are familiar to this rostrum, to this house, and to the delegates who are regular attendants at the Conference—issues that really have no place in a debate as serious as this, and one that runs to the heart of one of the basic reasons for the ILO's existence.

I will join those speakers who at the outset indicated their position on the question of apartheid, and I will do it not only personally (I do not think I need any personal attestation as to where I would stand on this question) but I will also do it for my Government. My Government's repugnance to the policy of apartheid has been set forth in several appropriate forums. We emphatically maintained this position when the central core of the matter was debated in this forum in 1961, as well as in the United Nations and other international agencies; and the reason is quite clear. We are unalterably and irrevocably opposed to apartheid in all aspects because we think it contains not only the seeds of destruction for South Africa, but it also contains a potential seed of destruction for the rest of the world, given the kind of world we live in. I think all delegates here, with very few exceptions, feel just the same about this issue as any of the speakers, including Mr. Johnson who opened this debate, and any of the speakers who have opposed him.

I think that the central issue was well put by the Director General and I can think of no one's eloquence or reasoning which could match the logic as well as the passion of his statement—a passion born out of experience and travail that democratic procedures and processes in the ILO had to undergo in order that the Organization might become the kind of instrument that it is for the attainment of the ideals that we all subscribe to.

It is very interesting, and I think it well to draw the attention of the delegates, particularly those who are not members of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, to the report of the Committee of Experts which is presented and being considered by that Committee this year, because one of the central findings was very interesting and it is well for every country, particularly every country whose representative takes this rostrum, to realize it; one of the positive conclusions that was drawn from that study of these experts is that discrimination in one form or another is to be found in every country, and, before any of us come up here in self-righteousness, let us realize this basic fact. And this is one of the purposes for this Organization. And how do we get on, and how do we go about it?

I would submit, based upon very practical personal experience as well as the experience that this Organization has undergone, that we all know that, when freedom of speech is threatened in any forum, the usefulness of that forum is ended. And this is the basic issue which is posed before us this morning: not whether we condemn apartheid—because I do not think any speaker, if he believed in it, would have the nerve, in 1963, to take any forum and seek to defend racial discrimination and particularly a system as bestial as apartheid is, so this is not the central issue—but the issue is how do we go about removing this scourge from international life? How do we best go about it?

I would suggest and submit to the delegates that the best course of action that has been suggested here is that which was outlined by the Director-General and an attempt to implement which was sought by the distinguished Ambassador from Panama, speaking for the Latin American group. We accomplish no positive purpose, we take no steps forward, by refusing to participate or by tying up the business of this Organization, an Organization to which we all subscribe, an Organization which we all believe has the capacity to take a step forward in attaining this objective in which we all believe. We cannot do that by withdrawing. We can only do it by, collectively, continually seeking new instruments and new weapons with which to do it, and I submit that we cannot do it by threatening another basic right.

The most effective instrument that we have discovered to define our position and take a proper course is that of freedom of speech.

I have a dual obligation to protest, deeply, almost bitterly, against one section of the declaration that has been referred to. I feel almost equally strongly on the previous one, because I think any implication that the executive authorities of the ILO are deliberately passive and have an inadmissible attitude on a question as important as this, a question that runs through the heart of an organization like the ILO, is unwarranted. Anyone who knows the authorities of this Organization, anyone who has had any experience in working with them, anyone who has looked at the record, cannot in good conscience and logic make this kind of statement.

This is an Organization which many of us are proud of. This is a house which has produced many social advances. It has led the family of the United Nations in these very issues, the very issue that is under debate and under consideration here. And this work has been implemented not by us delegates who come here once a year, or by the members of the Governing Body who come three times a year; it has been implemented by the executive officers and the devoted staff that make up the ILO. We do not serve our purpose by tearing down a structure.

And I have a double responsibility to take issue with the next statement, the one which refers to the personal and unconstitutional action of the Vice President, Mr. Rudi Faupl. There is little that I can add to what has been stated by the Director General and all the other officers who have taken this rostrum, because I participated in these discussions as a fellow officer, and I say that Mr. Faupl would not have been carrying out his functions, he would not have been carrying out his duties as an officer, if he had not protected the right that we all agreed on, that every delegate has a right to be heard whether we agree with him or not. He was not only carrying out his agreement as an officer but, more important, he was carrying out a much higher principle, the principle of defending and promoting the right of freedom of speech.

I would like to close by referring to a couple of, I think, basic fundamental statements that were made by previous speakers, one of which causes a good deal of concern and trepidation.

If I remember correctly, one of the speakers, in discussing this false dichotomy that I think has been set up between morality and law—because no law lasts which is not fixed on a moral basis—one of the speakers made a statement that we are not bound by the law; and I hope that I heard it incorrectly. The implications are that we are the law, and there have been more societies destroyed on this theory than on any other I know. We must establish, if we hope for continuity of the work in which we are engaged, a society of laws, not of men—I speak as one who was part of a group that has deliberately used the law as an instrument and has developed it into an instrument of social precision in terms of rectifying age-old injustices and terms of providing equality of opportunity. The American Negro has gone to the Supreme Court in the United States 38 times and has been victorious 32 times and each of those victories established another stone in the foundation of the climax that you read about and we are experiencing in the United States every day. I repeat, they have developed that law is an instrument of social precision. This has been the great protection. This has provided the means and the instrument for orderly evolution, or orderly revolution, whichever way you want to describe it.

I repeat that the central issue we have to decide here today—and if we do not decide it today we shall have to decide it tomorrow, because we shall meet it again—is how we can devise the means and the technique of advancing this cause of eliminating from the family of nations, from among decent people, the bestial system of apartheid; what

tools, what techniques, we can devise collectively in order to achieve this goal dispassionately and without rancor toward one another. That is the challenge which is before us, a challenge with which this house is not unfamiliar, a challenge that must be met by democratic procedures. In my first year in the ILO, at my first conference, this house was wracked by an issue as deeply passionate, as deeply emotional, as this one. It was the first year that the Hungarian credentials were challenged. That issue was resolved; it was resolved on democratic principles by staying within the confines of our constitution and by respecting that constitution, and in this way it became not only a stronger but a more living document. That is the challenge before us here today and we can only meet that challenge through a scrupulous regard for democratic principles, not by walking away from the struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members of this House would be interested in the speech of our employer-delegate, Mr. Richard Wagner. At a later date I will introduce the remarks of Mr. Rudolph Faupl, the worker's delegate. Mr. Wagner's remarks follow.

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, the Director General's report states that we must assess the future role and programs of the ILO.

The unhappy events of the past weeks point up forcefully the major failing of this Organization. It has not faced up to the necessity of maintaining its basic principles. Those principles are admirably stated in the Declaration of Philadelphia. The Director General in his report says in effect that these concern free labor, free employers, social justice, and economic development. In addition, there have been resounding declarations on human rights, freedom of association, on freedom from discrimination and on the elimination of forced labor and a number of other worthy objectives. But until now this Organization has closed its eyes to the necessity of fighting for and protecting these principles of human freedom. This is why we reached an impasse in conducting this conference. Like practically everyone here I am opposed to racial discrimination. But this is not the only question on which we must concern ourselves. We must insist on the elimination of repression of freedom of association, the repression of free speech, and forced labor wherever these practices are condoned or sanctioned by legislative edict or monolithic governments. Until and unless we find a way to make all of these practices where condoned by the force of laws or general practice, a mandatory basis for invalidation of credentials, this Organization will experience crisis after crisis.

The free employers have in the past undertaken to bring to your attention the importance of these matters and the necessity for action. They failed to receive support or consideration for their position. Chaos is the result.

The forthright position of the ILO on these fundamental principles is well known, and it is high time that nations which do not conform to them should either withdraw from this Organization or be relegated to the status of observers.

There is another unresolved matter which will sooner or later result in another crisis. That is the gradual breakdown of true representative tripartism. This began when the worker group and the employer group were deprived of complete group autonomy through the mockery called the appeals board. While this procedure is not sanctioned by the constitution, people who are not truly free workers or free employers but who are in fact agents of their governments have been given places on committees with the right to vote. The records of every technical committee and indeed the records of plenary sessions are full of evidence that these so-called workers and so-called employers vote only as do their governments on vital matters because they are government agents. This destroys tripartism and unbalances the relationship between workers and employers on the one hand and governments on the other. The so-called employer from the U.S.S.R. in his speech admitted state control of employers. The appeals board should be abolished and genuine group autonomy reestablished.

When the ILO was first established, there was a genuine need for a world organization which would promote sound labor-management relations, develop programs by which nations would improve the wages, working conditions, and living standards of workers and their families and provide a forum through which labor, employers, and governments might exchange mutually beneficial experience on social problems.

The purposes and objectives of the ILO were inherently sound at the time of its inception and for more than a quarter century thereafter. The essential purposes and objectives are sound in today's world, if the Organization pursued only these purposes and objectives.

The emergence of many new nations, with virtually no experience in handling their own economic and social problems, creates a new need which the ILO should be serving.

The deplorable fact, however, has been that, in the face of its new found challenges and opportunities for effective service, the ILO has been diverted by the Eastern European nations from its original purposes and has essentially degenerated into a cold war forum and an instrumentality for political propaganda.

I protested at last year's conference and again at the Asian Regional Conference against the use of this platform for such propaganda purposes. I had hoped that this year's conference would witness an objective discussion of structural and program matters without the same old propaganda cliches. But we have heard much more of the same. They accuse my country of blocking disarmament, cessation of nuclear testing—they rant against colonialism. Do they think you do not know that they themselves are the ones who are guilty of these practices? They come to this platform pretending to be champions of human rights and human freedoms—when they withdraw the foreign troops from Hungary and remove the wall in East Berlin, we may have less question about their sincerity. They mention Alabama but not attacks upon Africans in Prague and other racist incident in Moscow. Free speech is one of the cornerstones of all human freedom. The Communists not only do not permit it but anyone who voices an opinion which is not acceptable to the state receives prison terms or worse. It is a shameful travesty that these people from the totalitarian bloc stand on this platform and profess dedication to human rights and basic freedom while they continue to enslave whole nations under their own vicious form of colonialism. I am quite sure that you are not misled by the smokescreen that the Government Vice President of the Conference tried to pull over our eyes on Friday. The fact stands out clearly that he had no logical explanation for his stand in rejecting the resolutions which were a matter of urgency. It is evident that the Communist bloc pursues the policy and practice of creating chaos and confusion and division in every international body, including our own ILO. They have no regard for logic and truth.

The schism which has erupted during this 47th Conference is not the first instance of planned propaganda confusion which they have generated at the ILO, albeit it the most dramatic.

The Director General made it patently clear that the primary issue which had developed was freedom of speech and the orderly process of organizational law.

As a free American employer I would—and shall—support orderly procedures to wipe out legalized discrimination, but I shall always oppose organized movements to circumvent established rules and laws which are the product of the total conference.

It is indeed, ironic that the Socialist totalitarian bloc should advocate nonlegal procedures. In the countries under their iron control, no segment of population is permitted to challenge the supremacy of the state and the laws of the state.

I wish to make it crystal clear that I am in sympathy with the African nations, their problems and objectives. However, I cannot be in sympathy with the use by any one of methods which destroy not only the ability of the ILO to eradicate discrimination or to support other basic principles of human rights for which the ILO stands, but which would destroy the ILO itself.

As to routine matters of procedures which have been discussed at this Conference, I have the following comments:

A number of speakers, principally from the totalitarian countries have advocated divesting the governing body of some powers and vesting them in the Conference. One speaker said technical assistance programs should be the responsibility of the Conference and not the office. Another speaker proposed that the governing body should not arrange the Conference agenda. That body, he said, could make suggestions but the agenda should be established by the Conference. I submit, honorable delegates, that such proposals are completely impractical. The Conference is composed of delegates attending once a year, many of whom come only to one such session. Therefore, the Conference has no continuity and must entrust the arranging of the ILO's many activities to the governing body, the members of which serve for a minimum of 3 years, weighing not only programs, agendas, special activities, etc., but also considering budgetary proposals relating to all of these matters. Surely with 48 titular members and a like number of deputies, the delegates must have full confidence in the dedication and understanding these persons bring to ILO matters. This should be particularly so with the welcome addition of the new members in the governing body. To have just increased the governing body membership and at the same time propose limiting the governing body's authority does seem inconsistent.

One section of the Director General's report which I consider most important is his discussion of human rights and economic development. I regret that this has been referred to only by a few speakers. I believe that future policies and programs of the ILO should give a great deal of attention to this subject.

At the Asian Regional Conference on Economic Development some speakers from developing nations commenting on their problems said:

1. They need more financial assistance from industrial nations.

2. That they lack capital.

3. That their material resources are not adequate. The fact is, however, that their needs cannot be adequately satisfied by assistance from developed nations. There simply is not enough combined means in all of the major industrial nations to provide

satisfactory living standards for the nations of the world who have so little and need so much.

Some of these nations do have resources which have not been utilized adequately. This is so in a number of instances because of the lack of environment which would activate such domestic capital as is possessed by their own nationals—an environment which would attract private investment from other nations. The creation of a proper environment would help to promote economic development and provide increasing job opportunities.

Every nation has human resources. But these too must be cultivated and developed. Technical assistance—vocational training, education in skills, both worker, and managerial, are prime requisites to economic development. Education brings self-reliance and that brings initiative and ingenuity and the product of these is growth and opportunity. At first this process is gradual, but it pyramids rapidly as progress is made. That progress cannot be gained by edict—it comes through unleashing the latent capacities of people. The ILO can do much to assist in this cultivation and development of human resources.

From the wealth of ideas expressed here one thing stands out above all others. A majority of the people who attend ILO conferences sincerely advocate policies which will protect human rights and promote economic progress for men and women everywhere. We want better standards of living, freedom from discrimination, opportunities for education and economic development. The dedication, which most of you have shown toward these objectives, is a long step toward realization of them. That dedication speaks eloquently of the high purposes of the majority of the delegates. The fact is that most of the leaders in my country whether they be in business, labor, or government come from humble beginnings, and they are fully aware of the struggles our Nation had in its beginnings when it achieved its independence. Therefore, we feel kinship with the young nations of the world who have so recently attained their independence.

It was stated from this rostrum by a speaker from Eastern Europe that the Declaration of Philadelphia adopted almost 20 years ago was all right for that time, but that faced with a changing world it needs revision. It is true we have had many changes in the world—technological, in communications, in speed of travel, and in the establishment of new, free, independent nations. But may I remind you, that the Declaration of Philadelphia declares age-old principles of freedom which are fully applicable in today's world of rapid change. These are not idle words adapted to shades of meaning and interpretation. They express the desires of the emerging nations of the entire world. They represent aspirations of human beings everywhere. They reject the idea that people must be molded into a pattern of conformity and controlled thought. They reject the idea that individual desires, ambitions, decisions and actions must be forcibly submerged and that people must respond only as puppets on a string to entrenched totalitarian authority. These principles are positive—not negative.

The faults and weaknesses of the ILO pertain not to these essential principles but to the Machiavelian termites who for years have used their membership to undermine the true purposes and effective services of the Organization.

The ILO was not conceived and established as a world forum for ideological warfare. The ILO cannot survive as a forum for ideological warfare.

The challenge of this 47th Conference is to strengthen and revitalize ILO procedures and organizational methods so that its full membership shall be required to collaborate upon solving economic and social problems, generating economic growth, raising standards of living and preserving or, in many cases, reviving freedom of association for workers and for employers.

If this conference does not produce effective standards of procedure and refocus the direction of the organization's services, the ILO will most surely disintegrate from the explosion of those internal political forces which are now tearing it apart.

Mr. Speaker, before attending this conference at Geneva, I was of the opinion that the workmen of our country had advantages not enjoyed by the laboring man of other nations. I knew that the Members of this Congress had great concern with his every existing problem. Having served on the Education and Labor Committee of this House of Representatives for many years, I know that we shall make even greater progress in the future. Our standards are high and this is just. Justice to all, is ever our goal.

I have concern, Mr. Speaker, that international affairs are having an effect on our workmen. Certainly, I believe that we must provide those safeguards that would protect not only his income but his job as well. As a Member of Congress representing an industrial district, I am heedful of the job of every workingman. Too, I am worried at the ever growing list of the unemployed. With this in mind, I took the opportunity of looking first hand at the European Common Market. Certainly, we should watch its every action that might affect our citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, the potential of the International Labor Organization as an instrument of international good will is large. We have seen it reach the brink of disaster. While its potential of good will is large, recent events have shown that it also carries the seeds of its own destruction. I feel that these events foreshadow another crisis for its parent organization—the United Nations. The International Labor Organization, with its government, employer, and worker delegations from 108 nations can be a constructive force. I would say, however, that I can see no justification for our support of a Communist propaganda forum.

As I have stated earlier, the delegation representing the United States consisted of many most able men from employer and workmen organizations. I know that they will have gathered many important thoughts about our position. Therefore I have proposed to the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee that we call some of them before us that we might give serious review to our position in the international labor market, and our continuance as a member of the International Labor Organization as now constructed.

Our international problems are many and critical. I would aid those friendly nations who are in dire need but I believe that we must constantly weigh the cost. Most assuredly that cost should not include the jobs of the American workingman.

I come from a battleground—an international one. Words were the weapons used. The true words of the free nations of the world whose only concern was the welfare of the industrialists and workmen as opposed to those of the Communist bloc who would return man to slavery. I would propose that other Members of this Congress should attend other international conferences, not only to safeguard our interest but to show all nations our Congress' solicitude with the affairs of the world.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I should first like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio on not only representing us as an adviser to this subordinate organization of the United Nations but particularly for going in the status of a representative of this body and not our Department of State.

I, too, have been vitally interested in various of the subordinate organizations of the United Nations. I recall that I made a similar report on the World Health Assembly here a year ago. Further, I have reported to this body on many occasions about the relation that our State Department and our country have to the special and voluntary funds of the United Nations.

If I understood the gentleman correctly, we are contributing over 27 percent in the past 2 years of the total funds used by the International Labor Organization of the United Nations.

Mr. AYRES. We have contributed over 25 percent of the total budget directly and, of course, indirectly the State Department and Labor also have contributed funds.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman have any information about the contributions of the Communist-bloc countries as to the same percentages, and whether or not they have increased proportionately to ours since the inception of the International Labor Organization?

Mr. AYRES. No, they have not. In fact, the entire Communist bloc contributes less than 12 percent of the total operation. We are contributing more than twice the amount the Communist bloc contributes. It is also well to have in mind that we have only our vote, whereas the Communist bloc has several votes.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman means that our great State of Texas does not have separate representation on the International Labor Organization?

Mr. AYRES. No.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman very much. This I have also found in the special and voluntary funds of the United Nations. I think it is time we took a good look or had an audit in this connection.

I was especially interested in a further remark of the gentleman as we relate

one of the subordinate organizations of the United Nations to others, and sometimes very effective organizations. First, his statement about the Russian group using this as a sounding board for propaganda, a forum, even though they did not find cause for collateral discussion the relationship between our workers and representatives of employers and theirs, and our Government and theirs.

If, indeed, this happens, are we not, as the gentleman very well said, simply supporting this primarily in a lopsided percentage as a sounding board for Communist propaganda?

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman is absolutely correct. And that was what prompted me to suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor that this entire operation be reviewed by the Congress. Because if we are to continue to provide funds to give the Communists a propaganda forum, then we are not living up to our duties here as Members of the Congress and Representatives of the American people.

Mr. HALL. I would simply submit that when the gentleman gets into this investigation a little further, he will find there is no built-in mechanism within the United Nations itself to provide a self-audit of its own funds, regardless of the source from whence they come. I think this is all the more reason why either the Congress should insist that the U.N. do this or our State Department—or the Department of Labor in this particular instance, involving the ILO, should insist on the same thing before we open up our purse further vis-a-vis the lack of support of the Communist-bloc nations.

Mr. AYRES. I am hopeful, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri, with other representatives as we have such as Mr. Rudy Faupl, Mr. Wagner, Mr. Weaver, and Mr. Delaney and all of the advisers for the workers headed by Mr. Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, I am confident they will have constructive suggestions to offer to the Congress because they were concerned about the operation at this last meeting.

Mr. HALL. I join the gentleman from Ohio in hoping that this can be done. I hope the chairman of the committee of this House, the Committee on Education and Labor sanctions and brings about early hearings with these people. I happen to be a personal friend of Mr. Dick Wagner, of Chicago. I know he has traveled around the world for the past year speaking on these specific questions, and I am sure, as you have well said, that he was an able representative on your delegation. Again, let me thank the gentleman for what he has brought to us and to thank him for this complete report.

I further associate myself with the thought that more of the representatives should visit these organizations and see how the U.N. functions. It is a good hope for survival. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I think my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, has made a great contribution here today in his report on this organization, one which the Committee on Appropriations has been concerned about for some time. May I inquire of the gentleman if he found any reason why the contribution of the United States should be increased by $1 million this year?

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman refers to the contribution which starts with action in this Chamber?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. AYRES. No, I see no reason why it should be increased. As I have stated, unless we can get a review as to what is expected in the future, I would be for cutting the budget even to the point where, if they continue to use this as a Communist propaganda forum, that we withdraw funds completely.

Mr. BOW. Let me ask the gentleman this question, a few days ago when some attempt was made to recover for the United States money owed to the United States from the United Nations some of these contributions which they owe us, the statement was made that if we reduced this or recovered any of it, we would wreck the United Nations and we would be playing into the hands of the Communists. Does the gentleman believe that if a realistic cut was made in this that we would wreck the United Nations or that we would be playing into the hands of the Communists?

Mr. AYRES. I do not think we would be playing into the hands of the Communists by taking away their propaganda forum. In fact, the gentleman from Ohio who is well versed in these appropriation matters would have been very much concerned, as was I, had he seen the demonstration that was put on by African nations inspired by the Communist bloc.

It was at this point that the Communists showed their real strength in attempting to maneuver these less educated persons into their orbit. Also, it was at this point that the Communists in my judgment had prearranged, over a period of time, to have Mr. Sergei Aleksandrovich Slipchenko ascend to the presidency of the organization after President Johnson, of Nigeria, resigned to walk out with the African bloc. So the latter part of the conference was controlled by a Communist sitting in the chair. This had been prearranged by the Communist maneuver.

Mr. BOW. Would the gentleman tell the Members of the House whether or not during the sessions of the conference there was any question raised about the uncollected contributions by countries participating in the ILO but which countries have not been paying their dues to the ILO? Was there any discussion as to whether they should pay their bills or not?

Mr. AYRES. That point was not discussed at all. In fact, during the major speeches in the plenary session the bulk of the conversation was made by those countries who are delinquent, and the talks that they made were critical of the United States and critical of our form of government and dealt in propaganda that were downright lies.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, was anything said at all in these conversations about the lopsided employment of people in the ILO where we are making the greatest contribution and some of the other countries making much smaller contributions have most of the employment of the people who are in the ILO?

Was there any discussion of that matter?

Mr. AYRES. That was not discussed. In fact, I was left with the impression that those countries which are the beneficiaries of our appropriations are not too appreciative.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, I should like to ask unanimous consent that with my colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio I be permitted to insert in the RECORD a table showing the assessments of the various countries for the year 1963 and also showing the uncollected payments by other countries in 1963 as well as a list of employment, by countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The matters referred to follow:

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Budget for the calendar year 1963

I. Ordinary budget:	
Session of the conference and other conferences	$898,827
Salaries and wages	6,646,445
Travel and removal expenses	694,890
Representation and hospitality	42,000
Property account maintenance	380,053
Printing	209,357
General office expenses	280,500
Common staff costs	804,228
Unpaid liabilities	1,000
External audit costs	10,234
Special interorganization studies	15,000
Surveys:	
Factual survey relating to freedom of association	35,000
Action as regards discrimination	22,848
Contributions to extra budgetary programs	340,500
Branch offices and correspondents	627,749
Public information	82,500
Operational activities	1,279,000
Internships and career trainee programs	68,500
Furniture and equipment	157,500
Library	46,000
Building and other capital expenditures	57,791
Total, pt. I	12,699,922
II. Pension funds	1,285,584
III. Working capital fund	241,702
IV. Facilities in additional languages	350,626
Gross expenditure budget	14,577,834
Less miscellaneous income	−571,000
Gross assessment budget	14,006,834

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Distribution of staff by nationalities as of Sept. 30, 1962 [1]

Country	Number	Percent
Argentina	8	1.83
Australia	6	1.37
Austria	10	2.29
Belgium	10	2.29
Bolivia	2	.46
Brazil	5	1.15
Bulgaria	1	.23
Burma	1	.23
Canada	14	3.21
Ceylon	1	.23
Chile	5	1.15
China	4	.92
Colombia	2	.46
Congo (Leopoldville)	1	.23
Costa Rica	1	.23
Cuba	4	.92
Czechoslovakia	1	.23
Denmark	2	.46
Dominican Republic	1	.23
Ecuador	1	.23
Ethiopia	1	.23
El Salvador	1	.23
Finland	2	.46
France	66	15.13
Germany	21	4.81
Greece	3	.69
Guatemala	1	.23
Haiti	1	.23
Iceland	1	.23
India	13	2.98
Indonesia	1	.23
Iran	1	.23
Ireland	5	1.15
Israel	1	.23
Italy	10	2.29
Japan	6	1.37
Jordan	1	.23
Lebanon	3	0.69
Luxembourg	1	.23
Malaya	1	.23
Mexico	6	1.37
Morocco	1	.23
Netherlands	5	1.15
New Zealand	3	.69
Norway	2	.46
Pakistan	5	1.15
Panama	1	.23
Paraguay	1	.23
Peru	2	.46
Philippines	1	.23
Poland	3	.69
Portugal	2	.46
Rumania	1	.23
Senegal	1	.23
Sierra Leone	1	.23
Spain	13	2.98
Sweden	6	1.37
Switzerland	42	9.63
Syria	1	.23
Togo	1	.23
Tunisia	1	.23
Union of South Africa	2	.46
Turkey	2	.46
United Arab Republic	3	.69
United Kingdom	63	14.45
United States	33	7.57
Uruguay	2	.46
U.S.S.R.	6	1.37
Vietnam	1	.23
Yugoslavia	1	.23
Stateless	4	.92
Total	436	100.00

[1] Internationally recruited. There are also 631 in the locally recruited category.

Contributions statement as of Sept. 30, 1962, for the organization's calendar years 1957–61 [1]

SUMMARY

Calendar year	Total due	Amount received	Percent received	Balance due
1957	$7,617,708	$7,598,999	99.75	$18,709
1958	7,972,901	7,963,333	99.88	9,568
1959	8,529,857	8,519,621	99.88	10,236
1960	9,003,909	8,859,097	98.39	144,812
1961	10,054,660	9,685,512	96.33	369,148

Contributions statement as of Sept. 30, 1962, for the organization's calendar years 1957–61 [1]—Continued

UNCOLLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

Country	Calendar year 1957	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total
Argentina				$120,956	$149,828	$270,784
Bolivia	$9,141			10,805	11,829	31,775
Chile					35,265	35,265
Congo (Brazzaville)				1,535	11,829	13,364
Costa Rica					1,732	1,732
Ecuador				711	10,506	11,217
Guatemala					11,755	11,755
Haiti					11,829	11,829
Honduras					11,755	11,755
Hungary					41,143	41,143
Mauritania					6,319	6,319
Panama					11,755	11,755
Paraguay	9,568	$9,568	$10,236	10,805	11,829	52,006
Philippines					36,245	36,245
Syria					2,029	2,029
Uruguay					3,500	3,500
Total	18,709	9,568	10,236	144,812	369,148	552,473

[1] Contributions due prior to 1957: Bolivia, $20,785 (1953–56); China, $243,463 (1952–53); Hungary, $33,034 (1953); Paraguay, $25,621 (1920–37, 1956); Spain, $38,750 (1937–41).

Scale of assessments for calendar year 1963

Country	Percent	Amount
Afghanistan	0.12	$16,808
Albania	.12	16,808
Argentina	1.41	197,497
Australia	1.85	259,127
Austria	.35	49,024
Belgium	1.37	191,894
Bolvia	.12	16,808
Brazil	1.37	191,894
Bulgaria	.19	26,613
Burma	.14	19,610
Byelorussian S.R.R.	.45	63,031
Cameroun	.12	$16,814
Canada	3.39	474,808
Central African Republic	.12	16,808
Ceylon	.12	16,808
Chad	.12	16,808
Chile	.34	47,632
China	2.04	285,708
Colombia	.38	53,208
Congo (Brazzaville)	.12	16,808
Congo (Leopoldville)	.12	16,823
Costa Rica	.12	16,840
Cuba	.30	42,026
Cyprus	.12	16,808
Czechoslovakia	.92	128,808
Dahomey	.12	16,808
Denmark	.72	100,821
Dominican Republic	.12	16,808
El Salvador	.12	16,863
Ecuador	.12	16,808
Ethiopia	.12	16,849
Finland	.30	42,008
France	6.09	853,008
Gabon	.12	16,808
Germany (Federal Republic)	4.34	607,808
Ghana	.12	16,821
Greece	.21	29,416
Guatemala	.12	16,808
Guinea	.12	16,897
Haiti	.12	16,808
Honduras	.12	16,808
Hungary	.42	58,829
Iceland	.12	16,808
India	3.04	425,808
Indonesia	.43	60,230
Iran	.28	39,219
Iraq	.12	16,808
Ireland	.24	33,617
Israel	.12	16,808
Italy	2.37	331,962
Ivory Coast	.12	16,808
Japan	2.00	280,137
Jordan	.12	16,808
Kuwait	.12	16,808
Lebanon	.12	16,808
Liberia	.12	16,808
Libya	.12	16,808
Luxembourg	.12	16,808
Madagascar	.12	16,808
Malaya	.21	29,414
Mali	.12	16,808
Mauritania	.12	16,808

Scale of assessments for calendar year 1963—Continued

Country	Percent	Amount	Country	Percent	Amount
Mexico	0.76	$106,452	Sudan	0.12	$16,808
Morocco	.14	19,610	Sweden	1.62	226,911
Netherlands	1.15	161,079	Switzerland	1.29	180,688
New Zealand	.48	67,233	Syria	.12	16,808
Nicaragua	.12	16,808	Tanganyika	.12	16,808
Niger	.12	16,808	Thailand	.20	28,014
Nigeria	.21	29,414	Togo	.12	16,808
Norway	.52	72,836	Tunisia	.12	16,808
Pakistan	.61	85,442	Turkey	.71	99,449
Panama	.12	16,808	Ukranian S.S.R.	1.00	140,069
Paraguay	.12	16,808	U.S.S.R.	10.00	1,400,684
Peru	.18	25,212	United Arab Republic	.38	53,226
Philippines	.37	51,825	United Kingdom	9.36	1,311,040
Poland	1.24	173,685	United States	25.00	3,501,709
Portugal	.28	39,219	Upper Volta	.12	16,808
Rumania	.45	63,031	Uruguay	.17	23,812
Senegal	.12	16,808	Venezuela	.50	70,034
Sierra Leone	.12	16,808	Vietnam	.21	29,414
Samolia	.12	16,808	Yugoslavia	.40	56,027
South Africa, Republic of	.79	110,654			
Spain	1.07	149,873	Total (102)	100.00	14,006,834

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] for a provocative and thoughtful presentation of a problem which should be of real concern to us all. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Ohio that this entire matter needs to be reviewed. It does seem to me self-evident that we should have a current evaluation of what the ILO is doing, how it is financed, what it means to us, and if it is being used unfairly against us.

Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that I hope we are able to make a review and have witnesses before us who can provide us with their evaluation of this situation. I hope this can be done at a relatively early opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], is to be congratulated on bringing this matter before us today.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] with great interest. I may say, in all frankness, I have learned a great deal from the statements which the gentleman has made here today. Often I think, Mr. Speaker, the public is critical of Members of Congress who travel—even, I might say in my own case, I have looked askance at sending Members abroad to attend meetings of this sort. But I can only express my view today, Mr. Speaker, that if Members would be as conscientious as the gentleman from Ohio and report as promptly and in such detail, it is my opinion that much of this criticism would disappear.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed hearing the gentleman, and I commend the gentleman for a very fine statement.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman from Washington. As I said in my remarks, I hope the House in its wisdom will see fit to have representatives from this body attend all of these international conferences. There is no way in which one can get the exact information, that one can get the feel of what the Communists are doing throughout the world, other than to be there and witness their operations first hand. They are clever. We are in a fight, and we had better be there to see what is going on and set up the rules so that we at least have the opportunity to refute their misrepresentations in order that the weaker nations of the world will not be misled.

THE HONORABLE JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I have always admired and highly respected that genial, lovable, capable, sincere, astute, honest and dedicated public servant, the Honorable James A. Farley. Inasmuch as my good friend, of many long years has recently celebrated his 75th birthday, I would not only like to congratulate him and wish him another 75 years of good health and good fortune, but to include herein with my remarks an editorial written by my dear friend "Billy" Mariott, editor of that splendid newspaper, the Elizabethtown News.

Mr. Speaker, it pleases me greatly that this fine little country newspaper is located in my old home county of Hardin which is a part of the Fourth Kentucky District that I have the honor to represent, the place of my birth where "the salt of the earth" people live and have their being.

FARLEY

James A. Farley, one of the chief architects of President Roosevelt's first two presidential election victories, was 75 years old yesterday.

Mr. Farley, who has not entirely relinquished his interest in political affairs, is head of Coca-Cola Export Corp., with offices in New York City.

Mr. Farley was one of two or three men who led the campaign of Governor Roosevelt's nomination for President in the 1932 Chicago convention. Both suave and industrious, he made many pilgrimages into the States in Governor Roosevelt's behalf especially into the smaller electoral vote States of the West. Before the Nation hardly knew what was going on he had many of them firmly annexed to the Roosevelt campaign.

In the convention it developed when the Roosevelt drive appeared stalled, short of victory, Mr. Farley was credited with a leading role in bringing about the historic switch of the Garner delegates from California and Texas to Roosevelt, resulting in the latter's nomination.

After the convention Mr. Farley managed the Roosevelt campaign in the final election, which was a soft snap, and got the customary reward in being appointed Postmaster General. He was even more successful as head of the party in the 1936 campaign, in which the Democrats won in all but two States.

Soon thereafter relations between the two men, Roosevelt and Farley, cooled, and there was a link suspected between Farley and the presidential ambitions of Vice President Garner in 1940, which got nowhere.

Of all the principal figures of the memorable 1932 convention in Chicago Farley and Garner are the only two who are living. Gone are President Roosevelt, Governor Smith, Gov. Albert Ritchie, of Maryland; Secretary Newton D. Baker, of Ohio; Senator Walsh, of Montana, and former Secretary William C. McAdoo.

PANAMA CANAL ZONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a series of newspaper articles and magazine articles on the subject of Panama.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CRISIS IN CANAL ZONE: PANAMANIAN "ULTIMATUM"

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to this body on April 9, 1963, I dealt at length with the grave crisis that has been generated concerning U.S. sovereignty over our territorial possession designated as the Panama Canal Zone. Explaining that since the birth of freedom parliamentary bodies have preserved the just rights of nations against the misuse of Executive power, I stressed that the Congress in meeting its responsibilities as a separate and independent agency of our Government, must save the Panama Canal. To this end, I urge prompt action on House Concurrent Resolution 105, which was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] and is now under consideration in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This resolution, which expresses the sense of the Congress, would clarify and make definite the policy of our Government concerning the question of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal and thus end the uncertainty that has been created.

In Panama, the significance of the indicated address was recognized in banner headlines in isthmian newspapers. In the United States, so far as I have been able to ascertain, it was ignored by all major newspapers, thereby leaving our people in virtual ignorance of crucial facts affecting their vital interests on the isthmus and giving the influences bent on destroying U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone an unguarded and exclusive field in which to advance their program of juridicial erosion. Such failure, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the major press of our country and the Department of State, is deplorable.

PANAMA THREATENS "RADICAL ACTION"

Those who have followed the isthmian situation closely will recall that, following the visit of President Chiari of Panama to the White House in June 1962, a joint United States-Panama Commission was designated to review points of dissatisfaction in the relations between Panama and the United States. This commission is composed of four persons, Foreign Minister Galileo Solis and Dr. Octavio Fabrega, representing Panama; and Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., of the Canal Zone; and our Ambassador to Panama, Joseph S. Farland, representing the United States.

The work of this body was discussed by President Chiari with the President of the United States in March 1963 at the San Jose, Costa Rica meeting. It was also discussed by Panamanian Planning Director David Samudio during early April of this year in Managua, Nicaragua, with Director Teodoro Moscoso of the U.S. Alliance for Progress. During the latter conference, there was raised for the first time a threat of "radical action" by Panama in what was described as a "tense" meeting. What this "radical action" was to consist of is not known, but the discussion revealed that President Chiari is pressing strenuously for some form of dramatic and immediate concession by the United States to Panama as regards the Panama Canal. Why? The answer is obvious. He wishes to dangle a newly wrung surrender by the United States before the Panamanian electorate which will enable him to elect the candidate of his choice as his presidential successor. Such a surrender by our Government would undoubtedly have this effect. Hence the desperate drive for it.

SOLIS-RUSK MEETING, APRIL 23, 1963

The next move in the unfolding situation did not take long to develop—a working luncheon on April 23, 1963, in Washington given by Secretary of State Rusk. Though attended by Foreign Minister Solis, Panama's Ambassador Guillermo Arango, U.S. Ambassador Farland, and State Department officials, the people of the United States and their Congress were again kept in the dark as to what took place.

Before leaving Washington, Minister Solis left a memorandum outlining the pending Panamanian demands for Secretary Rusk, which was personally delivered to the Secretary on April 25 by Ambassador Arango. He did not enlighten our people as to its contents, nor has the Secretary of State issued any release with respect to the luncheon, the memorandum, or the "ultimatum."

Such denial of information, Mr. Speaker, calls for positive and protective action by the cognizant committees of the Congress in defense of the Constitution and the proper discharge of congressional duty. Whether the Department of State so believes or not, the Congress of the United States, as previously stated, is an equal partner in our Government. Moreover, it is charged with ultimate responsibility in national and international policy.

WASHINGTON SECRECY EXPOSED AT PANAMA

In contrast with the silence of the press in our country about the Rusk-Solis meeting on April 23 and the "ultimatum," the press of Panama gave these matters extensive coverage, publishing news stories with flaming front-page headlines that originated in Washington as well as in Panama.

The news stories published in isthmian papers show that the pending demands being pressed by the Chiari administration include:

First. Display of the Panamanian flag on all U.S. military and naval stations in the Canal Zone, and at the same level with the flag of the United States; also on all vessels in transit of the Panama Canal.

Second. Jurisdiction over a corridor across the Pacific end of the Canal Zone from Arraijan on the west bank of the canal to Panama City, consisting of the Thatcher Highway, the new Thatcher Ferry Bridge, and Fourth of July Avenue; and another corridor across the Atlantic end, the location yet to be determined. Both corridors would be carved out of the Canal Zone territory at the vital entrances of the canal and placed under foreign control—a condition impracticable in peace and hazardous in war.

Third. Use of Panama postage stamps in the "U.S.-occupied Panama Canal Zone."

Fourth. Turning over certain pier and dock installations at Colon and Balboa to Panama.

Fifth. Elimination of commercial and industrial activities in the Canal Zone.

Sixth. Recognition of Spanish, along with English, as an official language of the zone.

Seventh. Opening up the Canal Zone to Panamanian farming and cattle projects.

Eighth. Provision of free water to Panama.

Ninth. Equal employment opportunities for Panamanians in the Canal Zone, with social security and other benefits, including provision for a binational commission on labor.

More important, however, was the threat of "radical action" by Panama unless its demands are met by the deadline of mid-July or the present joint diplomatic commission, previously mentioned, is transformed into a body for the negotiation of a new canal treaty. What this "radical action" would be was not stated.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I can learn, the only information that the people of the United States have had about the doings of this secret meeting in the Department of State on April 23 and the Panamanian "ultimatum" were newspaper dispatches from Panama, of which two examples will be found in the present documentation. When the few crumbs of news given in them to the people of our country are compared with what was disclosed in Panama, it is easy to see how our interests at Panama are eroded. Certainly the situation on the isthmus is one that requires immediate and effective action by the Congress.

In these connections, Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize again that the Canal Zone is not an "occupied area" in the sense used in the isthmian propaganda, but a territorial possession of the United States acquired constitutionally pursuant to law and treaty. It is urgent that the status of the United States in the Canal Zone accorded by treaty and maintained by our country throughout its canal history be clarified and made definite by the Congress, as provided in House Concurrent Resolution 105. In the past, our Government has been forthright in the assertion of this indispensable authority granted by solemn treaty agreement, but in recent years, it has been evasive, cowardly, and, in practical effect, subversive.

CONGRESS MUST SAVE THE PANAMA CANAL

As to the Panamanian "ultimatum," such a threat by a small country that grew out of the movement for the construction of the Panama Canal is truly amazing, and would never be put forward by Panama except for the pusillanimous attitude of our Government. The danger, however, is real and cannot be dismissed as a matter of no consequence, for our Government always assumes a passive role and fails to combat effectively the excessive demands of Panama with respect to the canal.

The prolonged failure of our Government, the Congress, and Executive to re-

affirm our just and indispensable rights in the premises and Panama's preemptory and wholly unjustified demands and propaganda therefore have had the undoubted effect of creating the image among all nations, especially in Latin America, of the United States as an autocratic yankee imperialism oblivious to the rights of Panama. Thus, to the south of us anti-American psychological warfare in behalf of outrageous Panamanian claims is constantly being waged and in nowise opposed by our Government. This is destructive not only of Western Hemispheric solidarity, but as well of any successful operation of the Alliance for Progress.

As I have so often said, Mr. Speaker, the only way to meet these unjustified demands is by forthright and publicly announced declarations by our Government, the Congress, and Executive, that the solemn treaty obligations our country assumed with respect to the Panama Canal will be fully met.

The Canal Zone is not analogous to a U.N. trust territory, but is exactly what the 1903 treaty provides—territory over which the United States has full and exclusive sovereignty for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal. Except for such grant of sovereignty as an inducement, our country would never have undertaken the great and expensive task of building the Panama Canal at the cost of our taxpayers and its subsequent maintenance, operation, and protection.

The current generation of Panamanians may be blinded by their nationalistic zeal and demagogic leadership, but they must come to realize that should the United States ever leave the Canal Zone, Colombia, led by its radicals, will inevitably, if Soviet power permits, reassert and reestablish its former sovereignty over the entire isthmus, including the Canal Zone. Also, I may add, if Cuba can be taken over by the Soviets with the aid or acquiescence of policy elements in our Department of State and major news media, then U.S. control of the Panama Canal can likewise be liquidated. The process of erosion of our rights, power, and authority must cease and the trend reversed, or we shall be compelled to leave the isthmus.

In such event, Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Panama will become only a footnote in the "ashcan of history." Thus, ruthless agitators in Panama and their collaborators in the United States are playing into the hands of the long-range Soviet strategists for the conquest of the Caribbean in which the Panama Canal is the key target.

The radical and impossible demands now being pressed by the Panamanian Government and their secret consideration by our highest officials are undoubtedly pleasing to Deputy Thelma King, Communist member of the Panamanian National Assembly, and close friend of Fidel Castro, whom she frequently visits in Cuba. To what extent is she responsible for what is now transpiring and why did she recently visit the United States?

To the people of all the Latin American nations we would commend these considerations: The Panama Canal is a great protective factor with respect to the independence of all your nations. Should the United States cease to maintain, operate, and protect the Panama Canal, the Monroe Doctrine would indeed be a dead document, as was recently and so brazenly proclaimed by Soviet diplomats on American soil. If the Monroe Doctrine is dead, then agents of revolutionary communism will inevitably infiltrate the governments and institutions of your countries and take over, however much you struggle to remain free.

In these general connections, Mr. Speaker, responsibility for recent difficulties at Panama cannot be disassociated from the leading personalities involved. Our Ambassador to Panama, Joseph S. Farland, has outlived his usefulness and should be removed from that key post. The head of the Panama Canal Organization, which is a civil agency of our Government, is an active career officer of the Army, Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr. In addition to the criticisms raised by me in my address of April 9 as to his conduct, the explosive situation in the Caribbean demands that he be promptly relieved and replaced by a civilian of business experience and administrative capacity. The historic reasons for assigning only active Army engineers as Governors of this civil agency has long since passed and the time has come to complete the organizational modernization of the Panama Canal that was started in 1950 under President Truman.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is only one way out of the dangerous situation now forming around the isthmus: the Congress must act to save the Panama Canal by forthright declarations of our historic and time-tested isthmian canal policy of exclusive sovereign control of the Canal Zone with prompt adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 105.

The documentation on which my remarks are primarily based, quoted at the end of my remarks, is commended for study by all Members of the Congress and of the loyal press, as an illustration of news suppression long current in our country about the explosive Panama Canal situation. This can be overcome only by an aroused American people who are being denied information of vital importance about the Panama Canal.

The documentation follows:

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Apr. 23, 1963]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA AFTER HIGH-LEVEL SHOWDOWN WITH UNITED STATES—SOLIS AND RUSK MEETING TODAY IN WASHINGTON—RADICAL ACTION REPORTED UNDER CONSIDERATION BY CHIARI; WORK OF JOINT COMMISSION SCORED

Panama Foreign Minister Galileo Solis and U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk will meet in a private luncheon in Washington today amid indications that this country is seeking a showdown at the highest level over its claims for revision of the treaties between the two countries.

Solis left early Monday morning for Washington. It is understood he will review with the Secretary of State the problems of a political nature between the two countries.

He will be followed to Washington later this week by Engineer David Samudio, Planning Director in President Chiari's office, who will meet with officials of the economic section of the Department of State. Samudio will review financial questions stemming from the operation of the Panama Canal in Panamanian territory.

The announcement of the forthcoming Washington meetings are in the midst of a statement by Dr. Octavio Fabrega that he wants to withdraw from the present joint Panama-United States Commission because of discontent over the function of the Commission.

Fabrega and Foreign Minister Solis represent Panama in the Commission appointed last June by Presidents Chiari and Kennedy to review points of dissatisfaction in the relations between the two countries. The U.S. representatives are U.S. Ambassador Joseph S. Farland and Canal Zone Governor Robert J. Fleming, Jr. Both of them are in Washington now.

Fabrega said he understands that President Chiari is planning to take radical action in the situation in a short time. He did not elaborate.

Since the March meeting of the Presidents of the United States, Panama, and Central America, in San Jose, Costa Rica, Panamanian officials have been voicing displeasure over the slowness of the discussions of the joint commission.

The question was raised by President Chiari in his private meeting with President Kennedy in the Costa Rica capital.

The issue was pressed by Planning Director Samudio at a meeting early this month in Managua, Nicaragua, with U.S. Alliance for Progress Director Teodoro Moscoso. Reports from the Nicaraguan capital at that time described the Samudio-Moscoso discussions as "tense."

It is understood that at the Managua meeting the possibility of radical action by Panama was raised for the first time.

Now comes Dr. Fabrega's statement, carried in yesterday's edition of El Panama America, as follows:

"I have expressed to President Chiari my desire to withdraw from the Joint Commission which is reviewing relations between Panama and the United States, to which I was appointed by the President last June.

"My determination to resign is due to my discontent with the functioning of that Commission. I am satisfied neither with the results of the Commission nor with the conditions under which it has been operating.

"The fullness of the understanding between the Presidents of Panama and the United States notwithstanding, the Joint Commission has not been functioning as a high level commission, which was the name applied to it by President Kennedy when he appointed his representatives.

"I have not found in the Commission a propitious climate for the consideration of fundamental reforms in the relations arising from the treaties between Panama and the United States. I have found only a disposition to consider questions which are merely accessory, and even with respect to the latter, the procedure is so slow and complex that it does not lead to expect concrete solutions in a foreseeable future.

"For some time I have been expressing to President Chiari my discontent over this situation, telling him that my discontent has been increasing to the point that I consider that I must withdraw from the Commission. President Chiari has asked me to delay this decision for some time and this is the reason why I have not submitted formally my resignation.

"I understand that President Chiari, deeply concerned over the existing situation, is thinking of radical action on it in a short time."

The principal agreement announced by the Commission include the joint display of the Panamanian and United States flags in the Canal Zone, the recognition in the

Canal Zone of exequaturs issued by Panama to foreign consuls and the use of Panamanian postage stamps in the zone.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Apr. 24, 1963]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA CLAIMS WASHINGTON DELAYING TALKS—DR. SOLIS FILES COMPLAINTS AT MEET WITH RUSK—CHARGES UNITED STATES-PANAMA COMMISSION NOT DOING ITS JOB AND AGAIN REITERATES REPUBLIC OF PANAMA'S GRIEVANCES

(By Ben F. Meyer)

WASHINGTON, April 23.—Dr. Galileo Solis, Foreign Minister of Panama, reportedly complained to U.S. officials today that the United States-Panama Commission, named a year ago to work out problems between the two nations, is not doing its job.

In any case, he is understood to have said, the Government of Panama feels the Commission is not working fast enough, and that the delay is at the Washington end.

Dr. Solis, Panama's Ambassador Augusto Guillermo Arango, Joseph Farland, U.S. Ambassador to Panama, and a group of State Department officials were guests at luncheon today given by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. It was a working session, reporters were told, at which the whole range of United States-Panama problems was reviewed. A Panamanian source said he was told the tone of the discussions was most friendly and cordial.

Before the luncheon, U.S. officials claimed not to know why the Panamanian Foreign Minister had come to Washington. The presence here of Ambassador Farland and of Gen. Robert Fleming, Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, they said, was for other business. The two are to testify tomorrow to a congressional committee. Fleming attended a quarterly meeting of the Panama Canal Company, a U.S. Government corporation operating the canal and the canal zone, this week.

Dr. Solis could not be reached for comment and an Embassy spokesman said he had not authorized any statement.

Pieced together from what informed sources did and did not say, it appears Dr. Solis came to Washington to ask for speedier action by the U.S. Government on various matters under study by the two-nation Commission, composed of Ambassador Farland and Governor Fleming, for the United States, and Solis and Octavio Fabrega, for Panama.

Panama has suggested among other measures that the Panamanian postage stamps, rather than those of the United States should be used by the U.S.-occupied Panama Canal Zone; that promises of better opportunities for Panamanian workers in the zone are not being kept fully; that there should be opportunity for private enterprise businesses in the canal zone, rather than U.S. Government commissaries; that the United States should get out of the merchandise business in the zone altogether.

Dr. Solis plans to return to Panama tomorrow evening, the Embassy said.

[From the Panama American, Apr. 25, 1963]

UNITED STATES, REPUBLIC OF PANAMA AGREE TO DISSOLVE JOINT COMMISSION BY JUNE 1

(Foreign Minister Galileo Solis, who returned here from Washington early today, met privately for 2 hours today with President Chiari. It is understood that Solis reported to the President on the talks held in Washington with U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and other State Department officials. Immediately after coming out of the meeting with the President, Solis announced he would hold a press conference at 4 p.m. today.)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—The United States and Panama have agreed in principle to dissolve a Joint Commission seeking solutions to longstanding disputes over the Panama Canal.

The four-member Commission is to conclude arrangements on matters under its consideration and then dissolve itself. The group is expected to finish its work about June 1.

This agreement to dissolve the Commission was reached during talks here between Panamanian Foreign Minister Galileo Solis and high State Department officials, including Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

The Commission was created by President Kennedy and Panamanian President Roberto Chiari during Chiari's visit here in June, 1962. On the commission were Solis, Octavio Fabrega, U.S. Ambassador to Panama Joseph Farland, and Panama Canal Governor Robert Fleming, Jr.

Solis and Farland met here yesterday before the Panamanian Foreign Minister's departure for Panama.

U.S. officials stressed that there is no dispute involved in the decision to disband the Commission. It has been suggested that Fabrega's decision to resign speeded a decision to dissolve the group.

These officials said that the Commission would be able to conclude new agreements on outstanding problems and that it has carried out a considerable amount of work.

Chiari and Kennedy had intended to have the Commission arrange for the flying of Panamanian flags on the zone, which was done, and to solve other practical problems brought out by Chiari.

Among the issues before the group were equal employment opportunities in the Canal Zone, wage matters, social security coverage and other labor questions.

Also discussed at the time was Chiari's suggestion that Panama should have access to pier facilities and increased participation by Panamanian private enterprise in the market offered by the Canal Zone.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Apr. 26, 1963]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA SETS JULY DEADLINE FOR CANAL ZONE ACCORDS—CHIARI READY TO DISSOLVE COMMISSION

Panama has decided to dissolve the joint commission reviewing points of dissatisfaction in its relations with the United States by mid-July unless:

1. Pending questions have been settled by then, or

2. The commission becomes a negotiating body for a new treaty.

This is what Foreign Minister Galileo Solis in effect said he told U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk at their meeting Tuesday in Washington.

The mid-July deadline will mark the completion of 1 year of discussions by the joint commission.

Solis said yesterday Rusk had told him that immediate attention will be given to pending matters with a view to providing a solution during the month of June. The Foreign Minister reported to a press conference yesterday afternoon 12 hours after his return from Washington.

Because of the obsolete condition of the present Panama Canal, the Foreign Minister said, which must be replaced by a new waterway by 1980, the United States will have to enter into negotiations for a new treaty in 2 years' time at the most. He said this estimate is based on the fact that such negotiations would take from 2 to 3 years to complete and that actual construction would require from 8 to 10 years.

Any new treaty, Solis said, would be on the basis of Panama's retaining jurisdiction over the Canal Zone.

Throughout his statement, Solis insisted that there was no agreement during his visit with Rusk for dissolving the present commission by mutual accord, but rather the flat statement by Panama—conveyed to the Secretary of State—that it will close the commission if by mid-July the pending issues are not settled. Solis said the commission could continue functioning beyond July if the United States agreed to start negotiations for a treaty by them.

The joint commission was appointed by President Chiari and Kennedy following the former's official visit in Washington in June 1962. It held its first meeting in mid-July 1962, and the pending issues were explained by Foreign Minister Solis.

Display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone: Panama asked for such display in civilian installations, military posts and ships transiting the Panama Canal. Agreement has been reached only on display of the flag in civilian installations.

Corridors under Panamanian jurisdiction of the Pacific and Atlantic sides: Panama has asked for corridors on both sides so that people may cross from one side of the Canal Zone to the other without leaving Panamanian jurisdiction. Pending approval by the United States is the Pacific Side corridor which would extend along Fourth of July Avenue, the Balboa Bridge and Thatcher Highway to Arraijan. The location of the Atlantic Side corridor has yet to be determined.

Labor questions: The minimum wage in the Canal Zone is being raised to 70 cents an hour this July and to 80 cents an hour next July, but Panama still insists that it be fixed at $1 per hour. This is not the only aspect, however. The present wage curve in the Canal Zone develops slowly and suddenly shoots upward, with Panamanians at the low end and North Americans at the higher end. Panama would like to have a straight line rather than a curve.

On the question of minimum wage raises, the Canal Zone Government has been announcing such increases as a unilateral action, rather than as a joint agreement. This leaves the door open for future removal of such raises.

It has been agreed that a binational commission will be set up to handle labor conflicts in the Canal Zone involving Panamanians. The commission would be composed of two Panama and two Canal Zone members, appointed by the President and the Governor, respectively.

One of the first proposals made by the United States was for payroll deductions in the Canal Zone for Panama income tax from salaries of Panamanian employees. The procedure for these payroll deductions is practically worked out, but President Chiari has taken the position that it should not be enforced until after the wage raises go into effect. Panama is pressing for the 80-cent wage to become effective prior to July 1964, so that the $1 salary, if agreed upon, will start in mid-1964.

Panama wants the security classification eliminated from Canal Zone jobs, maintaining that there should be no discrimination against Panamanian citizens as to these jobs if they meet the same conditions required of U.S. citizens.

Stamps: The United States has accepted in principle the use of Panamanian stamps in the Canal Zone. Panama is of the opinion that the Taft Convention, under which Panamanian stamps exclusively were used in the Canal Zone from 1904 to 1924, should be revived. But the U.S. proposals involve conditions which are onerous and which leave the door open for the use of U.S. stamps. Panama cannot justify any agreement in this connection which would amount to less than the Taft convention.

Ports: Panama wants restitution of the ports in Panama City and Colon, which were dismantled at the time that Balboa and Cristobal were established. As to the Atlantic side, there is agreement in principle that—pending an agreement to change the Canal Zone boundaries—piers 6 and 7 in Cristobal would be turned over to the Colon Free Zone along with the France Field reservation, on the other side of Folks River Bay,

to help the expansion of the Free Zone and the city of Colon, now hemmed in.

Elimination of commercial and industrial activities in the Canal Zone: This is a delicate and difficult issue, inasmuch as there are conflicting opinions in Panama. The maximum aspiration of Panama would be for the Government of the United States to quit being a merchant and that all commercial activities be in private hands under Panamanian law. This maximum aspiration would be included in a new treaty, since Panama would retain jurisdiction over all its territory and consequently there would be no commissaries.

There has been a Panamanian proposal—still unanswered—that all goods sold in the Canal Zone be purchased through Panama.

As to industrial activities, the United States has withdrawn from some but retains others. Panama feels that the Government of the United States should cease being baker, dairyman, etc., and argues that while the basis of North American economy is free enterprise, there is no free enterprise in the Canal Zone where everything is state operated.

Spanish language: Not yet formally proposed, but already indicated is Panama's demand that Spanish be recognized, along with English, as an official language in the Canal Zone.

Lands: There are large tracts of land in the Canal Zone which are not required for the operation of the Panama Canal. Panama has asked for the return of these unused lands which are suitable for farming and cattle projects and are advantageously situated to the country's principal markets.

Water: This question came up during the Solis-Rusk meeting in Washington. Rusk inquired what the problem was about and Solis replied: "It's our water and you take it and sell it to us." (The reference was to the fact that the water sold to Panama by the Canal Zone comes from the Chagres River.)

At the start of the press conference, Foreign Minister Solis gave this background:

When President Chiari visited the White House in June 1962, a joint commission was created which President Kennedy himself termed a "high level" commission. The commission began its review of treaty matters in mid-July 1962. At the time that the commission was created, no limitation was placed on what could be discussed and Panama was left free to submit any point whatever of dissatisfaction in its relations with the United States.

Hardly had the Commission begun to work than a situation arose which had not been entirely foreseen: That the U.S. Government was not ready to discuss terms for an entirely new treaty. The U.S. position was that the studies for a sea-level canal were not yet complete.

It was agreed then that in order not to delay consideration of points arising from existing treaties, the Commission would take up such questions which could be settled directly by U.S. Presidential action without the intervention of the Congress.

Panama filed its claims. The discussions developed slowly because, on the U.S. side, the Commission was not the "high level" body that President Kenedy had named, for neither U.S. Ambassador Joseph S. Farland nor Canal Zone Governor Robert J. Fleming, Jr., (the two U.S. Commissioners) had been authorized to reach conclusions, but had to refer every detail—even of language—to the Department of State.

President Chiari felt that the first phase of the Commission's work—settlement of the problems which could be solved by Presidential action—should be completed by now. So Foreign Minister Solis was sent to Washington to tell the Secretary of State that President Chiari feels that he cannot continue with the Commission after 1 whole year had been devoted to questions of small importance.

President Chiari has decided that an effort should be made to have all pending issues cleared before the Commission completes 1 year of discussions, but if this effort proves unsuccessful he has decided to close the Commission and then report to the people of Panama on the reasons for his action.

Rusk also was told in President Chiari's behalf that in addition to the fact that 1 year was more than sufficient to clear up matters of lesser importance (than a new treaty), the political campaign was underway in Panama and these matters should be out of the way by the time the campaign got in full swing.

Rusk replied, according to Solis, that he understood President Chiari's position and that an effort should be made to solve the pending matters.

Thus, Solis explained, the commission should complete its work by mid-July, when the 1-year deadline specified by President Chiari expires.

Before leaving Washington, Solis said he left a memorandum for Rusk outlining the pending questions and the memorandum was personally delivered to the Secretary of State yesterday by the Panamanian Ambassador in Washington.

On the question of a new treaty, Solis said Panama is not pressing for it now because the determination if a sea level canal will be built will have much to do with the type of treaty that is negotiated. But Panama does feel, he added, that if the commission's work is completed during June, it will be time then to make definite pronouncements with respect to the new treaty.

"I have always felt," Solis declared, "that our relations with the United States can be resolved only by one means—that of negotiation. And negotiation requires skill and tact. Many times, precipitude spoils the skill in handling negotiations * * *. It is sometimes better to get to the end slowly, than to attempt to rush through and be left at the half-way point."

He said that prior to the National Assembly's sessions in October President Chiari may be able to tell the country Panama's exact position with respect to a new treaty with the United States and do it so clearly and completely that no succeeding administration will deviate from that line.

Solis declared that he told Rusk that time is past in Panama when treaties can be signed behind the people's back, as was done in 1903, and that no administration would run the risk of negotiating a treaty which would be rejected as happened in 1926 and 1947.

Asked if Panama had fixed a deadline for the start of treaty negotiations, Solis replied that a country which proposed negotiations was in no position to set deadlines. But in this case, he pointed out, circumstances favor Panama. The present waterway is regarded as obsolete and must be replaced by 1980. If construction of a new canal will take from 8 to 10 years and negotiation of a new treaty will require from 2 to 3 years, this means that the United States will be required to enter into new negotiations at the most in 2 years' time.

Asked about Washington reports that he and Rusk had agreed to dissolve the commission by June 1, Solis denied this. He repeated that the situation is that unless the commission completes its work during the month of June or it is transformed into a treaty negotiating body, then Panama will proceed to dissolve it.

A newsman asked if Solis felt that the commission would be able to settle all pending issues by the end of June taking into account that in 9 months' time it had accomplished little. He replied that if the U.S. commissioners show a willingness to work to that end, there will be time to find solutions.

The Foreign Minister said that at President Chiari's expressed request he had told Secretary Rusk that if the United States is thinking of a new treaty for a new canal, it should propitiate a favorable climate by: (1) quickly solving all pending problems and (2) providing really effective aid for the country's economic development.

A newsman pointed out, in connection with aid, that perhaps that help has not been forthcoming because the United States feels that any assistance provided Panama would only serve to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Solis replied that there were two distinct types of aid as far as Panama is concerned: One, the Alliance for Progress help which would be furnished on the same basis as it is provided to all other Latin American countries; the other, the aid Panama demands because it is not receiving adequate benefits from the operation of the Panama Canal in its territory. Whatever the type, however, Solis concluded, it should be utilized for the needy classes, and not for the well-to-do who are capable of looking out for themselves and required no protection from the state.

[From the Panama American, Apr. 26, 1963]

FLAG ON MILITARY POSTS, SHIPS, BRIDGE CONTROL AIMS OF REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

The Chiari administration wants to see the Panama flag flying on all U.S. military installations in the Canal Zone and on all ships going through the Panama Canal, as soon as possible.

Foreign Minister Galileo Solis said yesterday that Panama hopes for an agreement on this and other issues pending since last July will be reached by next June.

Another issue on which Panama hopes for early approval is that of jurisdiction of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge and the highway through the Canal Zone to Arraijan on the west bank of the canal?

Agreement and subsequent approval of these measures by the U.S. State Department will depend upon how much can be accomplished by the high level Commission appointed by President Chiari and President Kennedy a year ago this month.

Solis said the commission which has been meeting periodically since last July has only been able to get approval for only two of the several issues presented by Panama.

Solis said the commission—comprised of Canal Zone Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., U.S. Ambassador Joseph S. Farland, Dr. Octavio Fabrega, and Solis—did not have full authority and had to get approval from the State Department to change even a comma in a press communique or agreement.

Solis made these disclosures at a press conference yesterday afternoon. He had arrived early yesterday morning from Washington, where he met with U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and other State Department officials.

Before calling the press conference at noon yesterday, Solis met privately with Chiari in a meeting that lasted some 2 hours.

Solis said the only two issues which had been solved by the commission were the flying of the Panama flag at civil installations in the Canal Zone and the matter of exequaturs for foreign consuls.

Questioned about the remarks attributed to Fleming during the hearing of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Solis indicated that he did not feel there was any evil intent in Fleming's statement and added that he preferred to await an official report on the hearing before making any judgment.

Fleming was quoted as saying that Chiari had welched on his promise to pay Panama's water bills promptly and that it would be "dubious" if Panama would be prompt on

the payment of charges if Canal Zone piers were leased to Panama.

Other unsolved issues listed by Solis, and which the commission is expected to agree upon by next June, are:

"Corridors" on both sides to enable traffic from one side of the Canal Zone to the other without leaving RP jurisdiction. The Pacific side corridor would extend along Fourth of July Avenue, the Thatcher Ferry Bridge, and Thatcher Highway to Arraijan. The location of the proposed Atlantic side corridor has not been determined.

Panama insists that the minimum wage on the Canal Zone be increased to $1 an hour. Canal Zone agencies announced that it will be raised to 70 cents in July and to 80 cents in 1964, but Solis said the administration is pressing for the 80-cent minimum to be enforced this year.

Panama also wants the establishment of a straight line wage system instead of the current curve which develops slowly and drastically skyrockets with Panamanians at the low end and U.S. citizens at the higher end.

A binational commission to solve labor disputes in the Canal Zone in which Panamanians are involved. This commission would be formed of two Panama and Canal Zone representatives, to be named by the President and the Zone Governor.

Procedures for payroll deductions in the Canal Zone for Panama income tax from the salaries of Panamanian workers have been approved. However, the RP president feels that the arrangement should not be enforced until wage increases go into effect.

Panama is striving for the elimination of so-called security jobs which he said were greatly increased in number following the approval of the 1955 treaty.

Panama wants the Taft Convention, under which RP stamps exclusively were used on the Zone from 1904 to 1924, to be revived.

Panama wants restitution of Panama City and Colon ports which were dismantled with the establishment of Balboa and Cristobal. Regarding the Atlantic side there is an agreement in principle, dependent on an agreement to change Canal Zone boundaries, that piers 6 and 7 at Cristobal would be turned over to the Colon Free Zone, along with France Field, to provide expansion of the Free Zone and the city of Colon.

Elimination of commercial and industrial activities on the Canal Zone. The maximum goal would be for all commercial activity on the Zone to be placed in private hands under Panamanian laws. This goal would be attained through a new treaty since Panama would have full jurisdiction over all its territory.

Panama has made a proposal that all goods sold on the Zone be purchased through Panama. There has been no response to this proposal so far.

Panama is also opposed to the State-operated business policy which exists on the Canal Zone. Some industrial activities have been eliminated, but Panama feels there are others which should cease.

Panama has indicated its desire that Spanish be recognized as an official language on the Zone, along with English.

Panama wants the return of large areas of unused lands, not required for the operation of the Panama Canal, which are suitable for farming and cattle projects and are situated close to the republic's principal markets.

Solis told U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk during the former's visit to Washington that the United States takes Panama's water and sells it back to the Republic. This was in reference to the fact that water sold to Panama by the Canal Zone comes from the Chagres River.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Apr. 30, 1963]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA MISSION LEAVES FOR WASHINGTON TALKS; WILL DISCUSS COMPENSATIONS PENDING TREATY

A Panamanian mission leaves early today for Washington, D.C., to discuss interim compensations for Panama for the operation of the Panama Canal pending a review of existing treaties.

Planning Director David Samudio and Prof. Ruben D. Carlos, Jr., of the University of Panama, compose the mission. They will be joined in Washington by Panamanian Ambassador Augusto G. Arango.

Official sources have indicated that Panama is asking for $10 million a year during 5 years, which is the time that Panamanian officials estimate will elapse before a new Panama Canal treaty is negotiated.

President Roberto F. Chiari is understood to have outlined the proposal to President John F. Kennedy at the Presidents' Conference in San Jose, Costa Rica, last March.

Panama's official position is that construction of a new canal will require a new treaty. The estimate that about 5 years will elapse before this occurs is based on the generally accepted prospect that by 1970 the United States must have made the decision for replacement of the present waterway. Panamanian officials figure that actual treaty negotiations would take about 3 years and that in order to meet the 1970 deadline the United States would have to undertake negotiations in approximately 2 years' time.

The interim compensation, in Panama's view, would cover the fair benefits this country claims it is not receiving now under the present Canal treaties. They would be separate from any Alliance for Progress financial assistance.

The Panamanian mission is expected to start discussions with U.S. officials in Washington late this week. The proposed compensations would be invested, according to official sources, in highway construction and electrification of rural areas principally.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Apr. 30, 1963]

SOLIS SAYS "THINGS NEVER LOOKED BETTER" FOR PANAMA

Foreign Minister Galileo Solis said yesterday "things never looked better for us" in the matter of a review of treaty relationships with the United States.

He made the statement while answering questions on whether his recent announcement that Panama proposed to dissolve the current joint Panama-United States commission by mid-July indicated a collapse of negotiations with Washington.

The Foreign Minister said that was not the case.

"Whatever the outcome of the discussions in the 2 coming months," he declared, "either of the parties may undertake the steps necessary for the negotiation of a new treaty, whether within the present Commission on itself raised to the status of plenipotentiaries, whether within a new specially appointed commission, or whether by direct government-to-government approach.

"I believe, sincerely, that the situation is not despairing for Panama, but on the contrary, never have things looked better for us.

"It is not that I believe that our Foreign Ministry is doing anything out of this world. It is simply that times have changed in international relations in favor of right and justice for the small nations, including Panama."

At a press conference last week, Minister Solis said Panama proposed to dissolve the present joint Commission by mid-July unless (1) pending issues were settled by then, or (2) the Commission became a treaty negotiating body. Asked to clarify conflicting interpretations of his statement, Minister Solis said:

"In practice, the work of the present Commission was divided into two phases, not foreseen initially: One, finding a solution to Panama's points of dissatisfaction which could be solved without entering into an examination of the basic issues of the existing treaties; and two, the basic issues which can be solved only through a new treaty that would replace those already in existence.

"I went to Washington," Solis added, "with instructions from President Chiari to inform Secretary of State Dean Rusk that the Government of Panama felt that the work corresponding to the first phase should be concluded before the Commission completed 1 year since its installation and that to this end it was necessary to make an effort to solve those questions still pending before the Commission for which a quick solution can be found.

"I must say that I found on the part of the Secretary of State a clear understanding of Panama's position and that he expressed to me his acquiescence that all possible should be done to solve the issues still pending in the Commission."

Solis pointed out that the Commission will complete 1 year July 12; hence, Panama proposes to dissolve it around that date, regardless of the outcome of the discussions during May and June.

But, he explained, after the Commission suspends discussions in mid-July, the second phase—negotiations for a new treaty—can be opened by either country. When that is done, he added, the negotiations can be carried on through the present Commission, if the Governments so desire, or through a new commission, or through direct exchanges between the Governments.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, Apr. 27, 1963]

PANAMA PRESSES US

PANAMA, April 26.—Panama has given the United States until mid-July to settle differences between the two countries or open negotiations for a new Canal treaty. Foreign Minister Galileo Solis, who has just returned from Washington, said Secretary of State Rusk assured him the United States will try to solve pending matters during June. Panama demands a number of rights in the United States-controlled Canal Zone and seeks more economic aid.

[From the Evening Star, Washington (D.C.), Apr. 26, 1963]

PANAMA SETS DEADLINE FOR ACCORD ON CANAL

PANAMA, April 26.—Panama has given the United States until mid-July to settle differences between the two countries or open negotiations for a new canal treaty.

Otherwise, Foreign Minister Galileo Solis told a news conference yesterday, Panama will quit the joint commission set up nearly a year ago to work out agreements on disputes.

Mr. Solis, who had just returned from Washington, said Secretary of State Rusk assured him the United States will try to solve pending matters during June. Panama demands a number of rights in the U.S.-controlled Canal Zone and seeks economic development aid apart from what it is getting under the Alliance for Progress.

[From the St. Petersburg Evening Independent, May 7, 1963]

EQUAL PAY FOR PANAMA CANAL EMPLOYEES OR ELSE

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—Panama is getting impatient at U.S. failure to resolve long-standing problems involving the Panama Canal.

Foreign Minister Galileo Solis has set a mid-July deadline for satisfactory conclusion of talks between the United States and Panamanian Government negotiators here.

If, by then, such matters as the salary discrimination against Panamanian employees of the U.S. Government-run Panama Canal Co. have not been solved, Panama is going to insist on a complete revision of the treaties between the two countries.

Authoritative sources here say that Solis' warning does not mean that Panama is going to seize the 50-mile-long interocean waterway, like Nasser did the Suez Canal.

But it could mean that steadily improving relations between the United States and Panama of the last 2½ years will take a turn for the worse.

The question of payment of U.S. citizens employed by the Canal Company on the "gold standard" and of Panamanian citizens, doing the same type of work, on the "silver standard" is one that has plagued the two countries for years.

"No issue has aroused more bitterness in Panama," a U.S. report on U.S. relations with Panama stated in August, 1960. The problem dates back more than half a century, to the period when the canal was being dug.

During the construction period, there were separate housing areas, schools and commissaries in the Canal Zone to cater to the Americans working there on the one hand and to the Panamanians and Negroes on the other.

It was not until 1936 that the United States agreed in a treaty then "to assure to Panamanian citizens employed by the canal or the railroad equality of treatment with employees who are citizens of the United States of America."

In 1948, officially, the gold and silver standards were dropped. But the canal company began paying at the "U.S. rate" and the "local rate." While, in theory non-U.S. citizens were eligible for U.S. rate jobs, actually only 4 percent of the positions were filled by Panamanians.

In 1953, in 1955, in 1958, in 1960, and again last year, U.S. spokesmen have pledged, in the words of the communique issued at the conclusion of last summer's talks between Presidents Kennedy and Chiari, "to solve such labor questions in the Canal Zone as equal employment opportunities, wage matters and social security coverage."

Those were among the problems undertaken by the joint Panama-U.S. committee of Presidential representatives set up last year.

In the past, it has been popular here in Panama to blame the Governor of the Canal Zone who is also the president of the Panama Canal Company for the situation.

Now, however, Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., who holds the two posts, has spoken out in favor of the "slaughter (of) some sacred cows," including discrimination in salaries between U.S. citizens and Panamanians working on the canal.

Fleming has publicly voiced his objection to the "belief that any accommodation with Panama is a 'sell-out' of U.S. interests."

He protests that "legalistic adherence to 60-year-old treaties," such as that between United States and Panama which covered the construction of the vital Panama Canal, is unwise.

Fleming's statement, made prior to announcement of Panama's mid-July deadline, indicate U.S. Government representatives, on the spot, here in Panama, are aware of the urgency of the situation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 20, 1963]

U.S. PACT SEEN PANAMA AIM

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

PANAMA CITY.—Panama has thrown down the gauntlet to the United States. It has set a time limit in July for the United States to make certain concessions.

The question here is whether the United States will fight the demands or concede. For the United States to ignore the veiled threat of President Chiari to bring the people into the streets would be naive.

After his return from Washington recently, Foreign Minister Galileo Solis reported to the press on his conversation with Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Mr. Solis said President Chiari sent him to Washington to express discontent with the "high level Commission" appointed last July by Presidents Kennedy and Chiari to iron out differences between the two nations.

The Commission was composed of Foreign Minister Solis, former Foreign Minister Octavio Fabrega, U.S. Ambassador Joseph Farland, and Canal Zone Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr.

GROUND RULES SET

According to the ground rules announced, these high level representatives were to resolve problems existing between the two nations within the framework of existing treaties. These problems were expected to be settled on the local level.

At the outset the Panama press incorrectly described the commission as "treaty negotiators," which they were not. Local journalists vied in enumerating Panamanian aspirations to be consummated in these "negotiations."

Foreign Minister Solis reported the items presented by the Panamanian representatives which have not as yet been totally accepted by the United States. He stressed the demand to fly the Panamanian flag on U.S. military reservations in the Canal Zone and on ships transiting the Panama Canal. He mentioned use of Panama stamps in the Canal Zone.

OBJECTIVES HINTED

These are seen as patriotic symbols to win backing from the people of Panama. It is said the real objectives of the discussions are economic ones intended to benefit the ruling merchant class and the monopolistic industries owned by members of the oligarchy.

Among these points would be elimination of commercial and industrial activities in the Canal Zone, operated almost exclusively by the U.S. Government; transfer of certain lands in the Canal Zone to Panama; and a minimum wage in the Canal Zone of $1 an hour.

Panama has a minimum wage of 40 cents, paid by some concerns in the capital city, and 25 cents generally throughout the country, but the Panama Government does not pay even the minimum wages. It is reliably reported that owners of vast farms and ranches in the interior of Panama, such as the Chiari sugar interests, pay less than a dollar a day to employees.

MANAGED NEWS

The people of Panama are beginning to question the actions of their rulers, but it is hard for them to get the facts because of the misleading propaganda and information sources which are almost 100 percent controlled.

Six or seven individuals, through absolute control of Panama's press and radio, determine what the people read and hear. These few individuals have the ability to turn the public passion on or off. They did it in the deliberately directed riots against the Canal Zone in November 1959.

Some observers here see Mr. Solis' remarks about reporting to the people as an insinuation of a similar mob action.

A sign of things to come was seen when a newsman at the Foreign Minister's press conference asked if assistance from the United States would make the "rich richer and the poor poorer." Grassroots contemplation of this is growing, and the increasing discontent of the poor, both employed and unemployed, may erupt spontaneously, even though there is no capable leadership.

ECONOMIC GAINS

The Foreign Minister announced that Panama will be completely satisfied if the four-man commission becomes a negotiating body for a new treaty. A new treaty, with enormous economic advantages for Panama, is the real target of the demands, a Government official disclosed.

The United States is unlikely to agree to a new treaty until a decision has been reached about constructing a new sea-level canal at Panama, utilizing nuclear excavation methods to gain speed and effect substantial savings.

Informed sources say it may be 2 or 3 years before the United States makes a decision on this matter. Panama wants treaty negotiations to start as soon as possible. And, in the meantime, every possible concession will be wrung from the United States according to reliable local sources.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, May 13, 1963]

THE MONROE DOCTRINE: DEAD OR ALIVE?

The official Soviet view is that the Monroe Doctrine is "dead." But a group of Soviet Embassy staff members who visited the James Monroe Memorial in Fredericksburg, Va., April 30, got an argument on that score from an expert—Laurence Gouverneur Hoes.

Mr. Hoes is president of the memorial foundation, and a great-great-grandson of President Monroe. He also is the author of articles and a frequent lecturer on the subject of the Monroe Doctrine—a warning to European powers against encroachments in the Western Hemisphere, voiced by the fifth President in 1823.

Mr. Hoes presented Igor K. Kolosovsky, a counselor at the Soviet Embassy, with a copy of his ancestor's message and asked the diplomat to send it to "Mr. Khrushchev and tell him the document is very alive."

The gesture touched off a spirited discussion. Mr. Kolosovsky said "the document is completely dead." Others took up the chant.

"It got you out of Cuba," Mr. Hoes said, referring to the removal of Soviet missiles and bombers from Cuba last autumn. And he offered to bet "we'll get you Russians completely out of Cuba."

The visitors declined the bet but protested that the Monroe Doctrine was "an imperialistic document designed to keep Latin America under U.S. control."

Mr. Hoes replied that Russian diplomats and trade officials have greater freedom "to trade, barter, and sell" in Latin America than Americans are given in Iron Curtain countries.

"That took some of them aback," Mr. Hoes reported later. He also recounted this exchange during the argument:

"I don't think," Mr. Hoes said, "that Mr. Khrushchev would start firing his missiles over anything that might befall Castro and Cuba."

"I don't think so either," replied one Soviet functionary.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to my distinguished friend from Ohio, who, I assure you, knows this subject well and completely.

Mr. BOW. I have followed the leadership of my friend from Pennsylvania who really knows this problem, for many years, and I agree with him in what he has to say now and what he has said in the past. I wonder, however, if perhaps the gentleman might agree with me to one exception in what he has

just said. From my experience in the Canal Zone it seemed to me that when the Governor of the Canal Zone was one, Joe Potter, that a good job was done. I remember how he used his efforts to stop raids upon the Canal Zone, and I think he did a good job.

Mr. FLOOD. There is no doubt whatsoever that what the gentleman from Ohio says is correct. But Gen. Joe Potter is the same kind of not only two-starred but two-fisted general who could be equalled in what he was trying to do and did do only by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. Joe Potter was a great guy, and a great general, and did a great job. But he was an exception to the rule, believe me.

Mr. BOW. But I wanted that exception noted. I want to say to the gentleman that Joe Potter is now retired and a civilian. If I were picking an Ambassador to Panama, or a new Governor, and could appoint a civilian or a retired officer, Joe Potter is the type of person I would want to see in that position.

Mr. FLOOD. I would take the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] first and then Joe Potter. And then I think everything would be fine. I would like to see the gentleman from Ohio as the Ambassador and Joe Potter as the Governor. Then for the first time in 50 years the people of the United States could go to bed at night secure in the knowledge that the Canal Zone and the sovereignty of the United States would be preserved. As of now there is no feeling of certainty or security whatsoever. The sooner these two characters who are representing us there as Ambassador and Governor and on this Commission are removed the happier and better off the United States will be in Panama.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman knows that I serve on the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee. We had General Fleming before us this year.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, you did?

Mr. EVINS. He tells us that the United States has yielded in its policy and now the Panamanian flag is being flown with the American flag at 14 points in the Panama Canal.

Mr. FLOOD. And if it were up to this fellow it would be flown all over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone; because this is what happened. This House on a rollcall vote of 381 to 12 adopted a resolution declaring that it was the will of the House that the flag of Panama be not flown any place in the Canal Zone. And a week after that was passed I took the floor of this House and said to the House—we were about to adjourn and you will recall I said that within 30 days after we adjourned, the President of the United States would issue an Executive order authorizing the flying of the flag of Panama on the sovereign territory of the United States. And within 30 days after we adjourned President Eisenhower issued an Executive order; and now the present administration, to make matters worse, has permitted it to be flown in a dozen other places.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is correct. It was authorized first by the previous administration.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. To be flown in one place—maybe at the city hall. It is being flown in 14 or 15 spots all over the Canal Zone and there are increasing demands for other concessions.

Mr. FLOOD. The present Governor of the Canal Zone is a full-fledged butcher in the sense that he is engaged in what I refer to as salami diplomacy; he is slicing up and giving away that Canal Zone bit by bit under the ridiculous assumption that our little brown brothers to the South will be satisfied. He is just giving them more and more and more. Now we are at the bottom of the barrel and there just "ain't no more" to give away.

Mr. EVINS. An effort is being made to take over the U.S. ports and charge our American shipping for the use of our own ports. I might say that the General has too many responsibilities. He wears three hats. He is Governor of the Panama Canal. He is President of the Panama Canal Zone and he is on our Commission, appointed by the President, to serve with the Ambassador. Perhaps he has too many duties.

Mr. FLOOD. He wears three hats and as Governor he does not have brains or head enough to wear one.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. To the gentleman from Florida, of course.

Mr. HALEY. I do not think we are going to get any action in Panama or any place else until we have in Panama another Cuba. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has continually warned about the situation down there. I am sure he knows as much about it as any man in the Congress of the United States, and probably more. Through his warnings he has constantly tried to bring to the attention of the Executive and the Congress what the situation is, and those warnings have gone unheeded. Regretfully I must say this; I do not think we will have any action in Panama until we have a second Cuba.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course what my friend from Florida says is so. I had the great good fortune, as he knows, to be raised in Florida, as a St. Augustinian. I am not a "damn Yankee"; I am just a Yankee, I am only half bad. So in his backyard, so to speak, as to this problem not only of Cuba but the canal, he can be assured that this beatnik in the Caribbean with that fringe around his chin, is executing the No. 1 policy of the Soviet in this hemisphere, which is to acquire the canal, which is our jugular vein for hemispheric defense.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. I would just like to say that I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania has done his usual excellent job in calling to the attention of the House of Representatives and the American people the dangers which are inherent in the current situation in Panama. I have listened attentively not only today but on previous occasions when the gentleman from Pennsylvania has discussed the dangers which beset our sovereignty and the overall position of the United States with regard to the Panama Canal Zone.

Several months ago while on official business in the Panama Canal Zone I received indications that negotiations were beginning to take place then concerning the relinquishment of additional rights which the United States had by treaty and by law in the Canal Zone. The statement which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made today bears out that those indications were indeed accurate predictions of events which have since transpired.

I think it is the duty and the responsibility of those of us who serve in the Congress of the United States not only to listen attentively to the warnings which are made here today by the gentleman from Pennsylvania but to take the necessary action to translate these feelings into official policy of the U.S. Government.

I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in urging early and affirmative action on House Concurrent Resolution 105.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is from Georgia, one of the old 13 Colonies and our southern anchor in those days. He speaks in the very best American tradition.

You might like to know that several years ago when I was sitting on the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Commerce, which involves other "cats and dogs" which they had in the Commerce Department, which my friend from Ohio knows, as he sits on that subcommittee, along with the Panama Canal Zone for budgetary purposes, the then Governor of the zone was before our committee, and it was a hot, humid Washington afternoon, just as it is today, when we did not have all this air conditioning, and out of the miasma of the heat and fog I heard this witness say something about the railroad. And coming up out of a dream or a sleep or whatever I was in at that time, I found out he was presenting to our committee evidence in which we were getting ready to give away the railroad to the Republic of Panama. I found out later on that certain trucking interests in the great State of California were interested in seeing that this was done. Now was not that just ducky? Well, it was not done—because Congress stopped it. But I will tell you what they did do. In the other body, late one afternoon, in considering a revision of the treaty with Panama, they gave away—now this you will not believe—well, you will—you have been here a long time, you will believe anything—but for the people who have not been here for a long time—there are two or three new people here—let me tell you—they gave away the terminal buildings on the Atlantic coast and on the Pacific coast. You think I am kidding. So now the United States of America owns and operates a railroad without any terminal buildings. And you ought to see the condition of those beautiful terminal buildings that we

built and used to maintain. You ought to see them today. They are an unholy mess—a pig sty. Why American pig sties look like Tiffany's window compared to the terminal buildings now under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama.

And at the same time, and they insisted upon this as a very important sovereign right which was vital and necessary when we made the treaty in 1903, to preserve sanitation, because of malaria and diseases that you can imagine—Panama insisted more than anything else that they have the right to collect their garbage. So, by golly, we gave them the right to collect their garbage. And there is not a street in the capital of Panama today, in Panama City, that is not piled up to your nose with garbage. They want to run the canal and they cannot even collect their own garbage. The people in Panama would be tickled to death if they could relinquish this sovereign right back to us. Now by administrative action—and these two Americans on the Commission are seriously considering it, believe me, they want to give away the terminal piers in the Atlantic port and in the Pacific port—piers that are owned by us to the Republic of Panama, and we are to pay for the transaction. They want to drive a corridor through the Canal Zone at our expense, to be maintained by us, to be turned over to the Republic of Panama. A few months ago we just opened a $25 million bridge over the canal, the Thatcher Ferry. They want us and these two U.S. Commissioners are negotiating—to turn over the $20 million brandnew bridge to Panama—everything at our expense. They insist that we set up all over Panama something that we do not have in our own country—a full and complete civil defense system for the protection of the citizens of Panama—at our expense. Now there is a litany of things like this that they want. Within the last year we have agreed to permit Panamanian postage in the U.S. Canal Zone. We have permitted documentation of foreign consuls in the Canal Zone with the imprimatur of the Republic of Panama to foreign consuls. They now are insisting that there be compulsory arbitration before the World Court of any issues between the United States of America and Panama—compulsory arbitration.

In the World Court sits a distinguished statesman from the Republic of Panama. The reputation and the operation and the attitude of the World Court under circumstances like this, vis-a-vis the United States, if we go in there with compulsory arbitration we will get our brains knocked out in behalf of the Republic of Panama. Make no mistake about that.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the many things that this commission is now negotiating seriously with Panama. And, to rub salt into the wound, the President of Panama has sent an ultimatum, if you will, in writing to the United States of America setting a deadline within which time—and it is within a week or two—these demands of this commission must be met. He did not say "or else." Do not forget that the week after Nasser took over the Suez that there were Panamanians from their foreign office in Cairo asking "How do you run a canal, Mister? You took one. How do you do this? How do you take a canal from a big empire?" Thirty days later, for the first time, Egypt had an embassy in Panama City, and it is still there and tripled in personnel.

Mr. Speaker, the president of the city council of the capital of Panama is a Communist and there is a person by the name of Thelma King, a Member of the Congress, the House of Representatives, in Panama, who has declared openly time and time again that she is a rabid follower of Castro. She is running back and forth to Havana like a Greyhound bus. I wish she would come into the zone so we could get a look at her baggage and see what is in it. I know what we have found in some of the baggage coming into that area a few years ago. You know what I mean. Thelma does. She has said on the floor of their House that if and when there is a revolution in Panama, blood will have to flow, people will have to be executed, because unfortunately that is the way those things are best done. Quite a gal, Thelma, and as Red as her petticoat.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. FLOOD. To the gentleman from Ohio, yes.

Mr. BOW. Is this the same Thelma King that the U.S. Army decorated at the suggestion of the Ambassador of the United States?

Mr. FLOOD. As my friend from Georgia would say, "It sho' 'nuff is; it sho' 'nuff is."

Mr. BOW. Received a decoration from the Government of the United States, and she is everything the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, and more. How ridiculous can we be?

Mr. FLOOD. Yowsah. Yowsah. Yowsah.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to associate myself with the earlier remarks of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], with respect to the former Governor General, Joe Potter. I had the privilege of serving on the Panama Canal Company as a Director at the time Joe Potter was Governor.

Mr. FLOOD. I remember that; yes.

Mr. REID of New York. And I can only state that in my opinion he was one of the ablest the United States has ever had representing it in a key post. He showed an engineering knowledge, administrative ability, and diplomatic skill in a very sensitive post. I believe he well upheld the interest of the United States while trying to resolve those matters that were pertinent as between the Canal Zone and the Government of Panama.

If we had more Joe Potters in the Corps of Engineers, I would recommend to the gentleman most highly that he be given every consideration for appointment as Governor of the Canal Zone because, in my judgment, he is and has been outstanding.

Mr. FLOOD. That is what cost him his job. Everything that my friend has said is true. If you want to hear members from the isthmus, I could not have said that better myself, and that is a pretty high compliment, you know. But it cost Joe Potter his job. They cut his head off. They fired him because he was as good as you and I know he was.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks with regard to Joe Potter. I lost touch with the Panama Canal Company when I went overseas and served in Israel, but I did wish to pay a personal tribute to Joe Potter, because he was outstanding, and the record should so state.

Mr. FLOOD. I congratulate the gentleman, and I put it in your lap from now on, and this time you cannot get away from it.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman for calling again to the attention of the House, and it is not the first time he has done it, the gradual erosion in our sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Mr. FLOOD. That is a good word. "Erosion" is a good word in this case.

Mr. CASEY. And I want to solicit your very vigorous support for a bill that I have introduced to stop one of these inroads. There is a proposal that the Governor has in mind to stop using Canal Zone stamps and to use Republic of Panama stamps and just overprint them with "C.Z." In my opinion, that would be a further relinquishment of our sovereignty over the Canal Zone and a further bowing down to the demands that have been continually made there.

Mr. FLOOD. My friend, that is being done now. I have taken this up with the Congressional Committee on Postal Matters and I have been advised that under existing law in the State Department they can do this administratively. That is why I know you are acting, because it has been done administratively. I will certainly support your bill, because you are trying to do in your way what I am trying to do in mine, which is stop this erosion of our sovereignty. And what is more sovereign, what in the world is a greater symbol of national sovereignty, than the flag? The flag of the United States of America is the accepted international symbol of our sovereignty. Yet in the Canal Zone the Panamanian flag flies with ours.

Mr. CASEY. If the gentleman will yield further, as you will recall, this House passed a resolution against the flying of the Panamanian flag.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. CASEY. And it was again done by Executive order.

Mr. FLOOD. I commented on that a half an hour ago at some length and, if I can say modestly, vehemently.

Mr. CASEY. I am sure you did.

Mr. FLOOD. If I were not in this Hall, I would probably comment in another language, if you know what I mean.

Mr. CASEY. Again I want to commend the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank you.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. I would like to associate myself with the distinguished and able gentleman from the State of Pennsylvania. He has been the watchdog of this very crucial, vital spot in our Nation's history. He has forgotten more accidentally than all of those fellows down there trying to run the place know on purpose. I for one am going to follow your leadership in the future as I have in the past, because, as I say, you are a great American in my book. You know what is going on, and we are behind you all the way.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad to have my friend from Kentucky say that. I knew him when he did not wear shoes. He came here with me, I think 100 years ago it seems now, right out of the Army. I think the only clothes he had on his back were the khaki pants he was wearing when he got off the ship. But then as now a great patriotic American.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for his remarks and for his untiring efforts to prevent the surrender of U.S. sovereignty in the Panama Canal Zone. This is a matter that every Member of Congress should interest himself in.

In April of this year a hearing was held on a bill introduced by the gentlewoman from Missouri, Congresswoman SULLIVAN, the very able chairman of the House Subcommittee on Panama Canal, which would prevent any new concessions by the U.S. Government in respect to the Panama Canal Zone without authorization of Congress.

This bill, H.R. 3999 provides that no activity included in an approved budget for the Panama Canal Co. shall be discontinued and no real property interest used in such activity shall be disposed of except to another U.S. Federal agency, unless specifically authorized through a new or revised budget program.

On April 29, I stated in a release to my constituents that the United States should not at this critical time relinquish any control or direction over piers, docks, or roads in the Canal Zone.

Any further concessions to the Republic of Panama in respect to the Canal would not diminish rising nationalism: on the contrary it would merely encourage new demands. In my opinion the United States should insist on adherence to the treaty between the United States and Panama.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Panama Canal, I urge Members to support appropriate bills and resolutions to halt the threatening deterioration of U.S. sovereignty in the Canal Zone.

PROBLEMS IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the leader of the world. It is the subject of criticism and it is the recipient of praise. Peoples throughout the earth envy our prosperity and our freedom. We are indeed fortunate to have been given birth in this great Nation.

Our country, even with its rapid advancement technologically, scientifically, industrially, agriculturally, and socially, still has a multitude of yet unsolved problems of great proportions.

As Representatives in the legislative body of our Government, it is our duty to work diligently to achieve the best life for our people under a free and democratic government. It is with this thought in mind that I humbly address the House today.

All Americans have a stake in all proposed legislation. Therefore, all Americans must be considered when one discusses the effects of the proposals should they be enacted into law.

The clock of time ticks away and every 24 hours a new day is born. What transpired yesterday is history today and man's actions today are inscribed on the pages of history tomorrow.

Our wonderful Nation has contributed significantly to the annals of history. We have, through trial and error, through love and determination, made democracy work for almost 200 years. Again, now, we must join together and demonstrate to the world's anxious eyes that we, an enlightened people. can solve the problem of full citizenship for all Americans.

The narrow, crooked streets of the 18th century are being replaced by broad straight boulevards in this the 20th century. The narrow warped conception of some Americans with respect to race and creed must also be replaced by broad understanding of the rights of every person to live in human dignity.

The task cannot be solved by a few. It needs the full participation of all elements in our society. This challenge can and must be resolved. We must proceed, alert to the fact that the individual freedom of some cannot be forsaken for the individual freedom of others. The basic principles set forth in our Constitution must continue to be guideposts for the protection of all.

In this year, 1963, the complexities of the numerous serious problems confronting our still young Nation, contribute greatly to the social and economic unrest of men and women of all ages, of all races, and of all faiths. The tremendous increase in population and the rapid automation of industry have resulted in a severe scarcity of jobs, causing unrest and insecurity in the minds of millions of unemployed. Young people are flowing into the labor market where opportunities are limited for the undereducated and the untrained.

Full employment for all citizens is the solution to much of the discord of today. Congress must provide the leadership necessary to bring about jobs for all. There are many fields where such leadership and forward-looking legislation are a vital need.

For example:

First. Encouragement and aid to our domestic manufacturers to enable them to meet foreign competition by competition, not by subsidies.

Second. Aid to small business.

Third. Tax cuts to give economic incentive for business growth.

Fourth. Better educational facilities. Better training of our youth for the needs of the future.

Fifth. Solutions for juvenile delinquency and the current growth of crime.

Sixth. Greater employment opportunities for workers over 40.

Seventh. Retraining of dislocated workers—this program is in urgent need of speeding up and expansion.

Eighth. Elimination of job discrimination.

Ninth. Better mental health and rehabilitation facilities—these are needed now to correct shameful conditions in almost every State.

Full employment has been achieved in many of the Western European countries. France, Germany, and Switzerland import large numbers of workers to meet an actual shortage of labor. Some of these countries enjoy U.S. foreign aid. This money going to prosperous countries should remain here and be used to develop our country and to put Americans to work. The executive branch of our Government cannot and should not have to provide all the initiative and leadership to move our country forward. This great body of legislators must not continue to sit without action. Partisanship must not delay our pursuit of the tasks before us.

Democrats and Republicans, management and labor, white and Negro, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew—all groups, working together in the true American unity of purpose, must approach our problems seeking solutions that will strengthen our Nation against every segment that seeks to undermine and to destroy. As we approach these problems together, let us not forget that even though our Constitution is clear as to separation of church and state, it does not prohibit our being ever aware of the presence of Almighty God, who has been so generous with His gifts to our Nation.

May we so act in these perilous times that we shall continue to receive His blessings. We have accepted responsibility and we should have the stamina, the desire, and the courage to discharge the obligations of our office.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should like to compliment the gentleman on a very fine and thoughtful speech to the House this afternoon. His closing remarks were reminiscent in many ways of an admonition and request that was made to this House many years ago by a great and now departed Speaker of the House, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas.

I certainly commend the gentleman on his remarks today.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

BRACERO VITAL IN SALINAS VALLEY

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, recently here in Washington, D.C., Hard-en Krisp brand asparagus was sold for 69 cents a pound, retail. This was a quality product grown in the Salinas Valley in my district. A few braceros assisted in the production of this asparagus. Although the bracero comprised only a small percentage of the total labor force, he was vital. Other labor was not available. Without the bracero, the asparagus would not have been harvested. The return to the farmer was less than 9 cents per pound. The balance of 60 cents for every pound went to labor, braceros, shippers, manufacturers, truckers, suppliers, grocers, and so forth, throughout the United States.

This farmer and a few braceros made it possible for literally thousands of other persons throughout the United States to earn a livelihood and to enjoy healthful and delicious asparagus.

Without this farmer and these few braceros, these thousands of small and large businessmen and employees will suffer losses of employment. Consumers will be deprived of this asparagus.

May I suggest that Members of Congress inquire in their respective districts concerning the numbers of people dependent upon the row crop vegetable industry in my district for their livelihood. Also I would be interested in hearing from a housewife in any congressional district who would prefer the discontinuance of the bracero program if she knew that the supply of salad vegetables would be markedly diminished and the price increased thereby.

I would like to request the Members of Congress to open-mindedly reconsider the bracero program and its many direct and indirect consequnces upon the businessman, employee, and consumer in his own district. I believe he would then find merit in some extension of the bracero program.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER prc tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original sponsors of the 1961 act which created the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, I have been particularly concerned that the Agency be allowed to continue its work under the best possible circumstances.

To make this possible, I am introducing a bill that would place the Agency within the normal appropriations process and greatly simplify its procedures for handling the security clearances of its contractor personnel.

When the Agency was established in 1961, it was placed under a $15 million appropriations ceiling. This bill would remove the ceiling and put the Agency on the same footing with other departments and bureaus who request appropriations from Congress on a year-to-year basis.

The second section of the bill provides that contractors and subcontractors of the Agency and their employees may receive security clearances on the basis of an investigation, conducted by a Government agency other than the Civil Service Commission or the Federal Bureau of Investigation, providing the clearance meets the same standards.

Enactment of this section will in no way impair our overall security system. The same standards will apply. Thus, if a contractor's employee has been cleared by another agency, such as the Department of Defense, and that clearance meets the same standards as one conducted by the FBI or the Civil Service Commission, a further investigation will not be necessary.

This provision will eliminate duplication and expense and prevent delay in the effectiveness of a contract. Under present rules a duplicate clearance has consumed up to 4 months of a 1-year contract in some instances.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, will enable the Disarmament Agency to carry out the mandate of Congress with greater flexibility, efficiency, and economy.

WORLD WAR I PENSION: WHAT'S IT ABOUT?

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Our Nation has always been concerned with the welfare of veterans who fought to protect American liberty. Through the years the Congress has been generous in providing pensions, medical care, and other benefits to veterans, and their widows and dependents.

In fact, services to veterans make up the fourth largest item in the budget for the current year. After expenditures for national defense, interest on the national debt, and the Department of Agriculture, the $5.5 billion being spent by the Veterans' Administration during fiscal 1963 is next in amount.

This year there has been considerable interest from World War I veteran groups in H.R. 2332, the World War I pension bill. This bill would pay each World War I veteran or his widow $100 a month if the veteran had been honorably discharged with 90 days of service. The bill is before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Since the close of World War I, veterans of the First World War have received $33.5 billion in benefits. World War I veterans comprise 11 percent of veterans living in the Nation today and, in fiscal year 1963, are receiving 40 percent—$2 billion—of the expenditures for veterans

Many needy veterans are receiving deserved help. At the present time 1,862,-865 World War I veterans and widows are receiving non-service-connected pensions because they meet certain requirements in regard to disability, unemployability, and have met the established income limits of the law. These limits are $3,000 for the veteran with dependents and $1,800 for the single veteran or widow.

Several things, I am told, have discouraged action by the Veterans Committee on H.R. 2332 and its $100 a month pension. The bill has no requirements that veterans demonstrate illness or disability. There is no specific age requirement. Under H.R. 2332, individuals could have a combined income of up to at least $6,000 per year, including a tax free pension of $100 per month.

Yet the median income of all families headed by a 65-year-old individual is only $2,897 per year. Half the male population of this country has an income of only $4,081 or less per year.

The committee seems to feel that H.R. 2332 discriminates against the real veteran hardship cases. Of the $1,266,-247,000 proposed to be spent for increased pensions the first year of enactment, only $453,818,000 would go to increase pensions for the 1,862,965 low income veterans and widows now on the rolls. But $812,429,000 would go to add 713,100 new cases from the upper income groups to the rolls. In other words, one-fourth of the veterans and widows from the upper income groups would receive two-thirds of the benefits.

The difficult situation caused for older people by the squeeze of inflationary prices is due largely to increased Government spending and deficit financing. The plight of older needy veterans is very sad; but the pension proposal would ultimately add billions to Federal spending, and thus aggravate the basic cause of inflation. If we all work together in behalf of economy in Government, deficit financing and spiraling inflation can be ended. Then veterans and nonveterans alike can have the advantage of a dollar which has constant value, so the savings set aside during productive years will support a decent retirement.

SOLE-SOURCE PURCHASE OF RADIOS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, how long are we going to let the self-styled bureaucratic demigogs in the defense areas of our Government thumb their collective noses at the Members of this Congress? How long are we going to allow them to tell us one thing and do another with impunity? This is exactly what is being done right now in the Navy Department by Kenneth E. BeLieu, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics. He is acting in direct contradiction to an assurance he gave a committee of this Congress just about a year ago today and unless he is called to task severely, he will fulfill his desires.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about another sole-source purchase of the AN/PRC–41 walkie-talkie radio by the Navy Department. This is the same radio which I said a year ago could be manufactured by any manufacturer with a reasonable degree of competence and which the Navy sole-sourced—bought without competition—at a $1 million penalty to the American taxpayer.

It is the same radio which Assistant Secretary BeLieu assured my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable EDWARD F. HÉBERT, would be purchased competitively the next time around. Mr. BeLieu's words are found on page 96 of the Hébert subcommittee hearings and are plain—the Navy promised to buy the AN/PRC–41 competitively on the second buy. Now, it is ramming through another sole-source deal to the sole-source developer and manufacturer, heedless of what it said a year ago. In its view, apparently, "then was then and now is now."

Today, I want to go into this whole transaction again, to show the Members of this House the way in which our military lives up to its word. Today, I want to illustrate again the need for passage of my bill, H.R. 4409, to establish a joint watchdog committee to breathe down the necks of these high salaried name signers as they go about their task of spending more than half of our total budget.

In June 1958, the Navy Department Bureau of Ships negotiated a sole-source—no competition—contract with Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for the development of a radio communications transmitter receiver—a walkie-talkie, if you please. Let me state here and now that I hold no grudge against Collins. It is in business to make money. It simply plays by the rules the Defense Department lays down and, I would say, follows them scrupulously. But the rules are calculated to drive an economy-minded man to distraction. They open up all sorts of avenues for waste, corruption, and worse.

Collins was paid about $1 million for the development of this radio which became the AN/PRC–41 walkie-talkie. The contract included submission of a model, drawings, plans, and specifications, and that is normal. What is extremely abnormal is that when the development work was almost complete, a Navy official wrote a confidential letter to Collins telling them the Navy had decided it was not necessary to submit plans and drawings as originally planned.

The very idea. After spending $1 million for a radio development job, some Navy swivel-chair expert decides that the taxpayers are not to get the benefit of the work.

Within 30 days after the transmittal of this letter, the same Navy engineer caused to be issued an urgent procurement request to buy up to 670 units of the radio, without competition, from the Collins Co.

Here, as in so many other cases I have studied, an urgent requirement for the radios was generated near the end of a development contract. The word "urgency" is tired and overworked, and in this case, the word should be used in its most extreme application because the Navy said it needed these radios in 10 months. Please remember—10 months was to be allowed to build the first radios.

Since I do not want to bore you with past history, I shall merely sketch the next steps. I obtained enough technical data to allow a manufacturer to submit a bid for the equipment which was $1 million lower than the Collins bid. The Navy, through supposed changes in regulations which were kept in a locked drawer, through all sorts of feints, sidesteps, and elusive tactics, maintained its contention that it was going to give the contract to Collins. And it did.

While sitting with the Armed Services Committee's Special Investigating Subcommittee purely as an observer, and while unable to ask a single question or make a single comment, I was harangued in an emotional appeal by Mr. BeLieu, who wrapped himself in the flag so tight I thought he would choke. Let me insert here that I would have liked to have been asking Mr. BeLieu many questions, as well as many other Navy people, some of whom had been conveniently sent on vacation when the hearings took place.

Stripped of its emotion and appeal to the patriotism which burns in all our hearts, Mr. BeLieu's case boiled down to urgency of delivery. He tried to throw in the complicated nature of the equipment but that one evaporated.

Since the procurement laws exist as at present, no one—not even the President of the United States—could change Mr. BeLieu's decision. On procurement matters, he is all powerful. You will agree, I think, he holds an enviable position of power and is in a key position to do much good—or much harm—to this Nation's financial welfare.

During his interrogation by the chairman, Mr. BeLieu said he was going to make it his personal business to see that drawings were delivered for the AN/PRC–41 and that competition would be secured on the next contract. After all, the drawings were 90 percent complete then, even according to Navy's words.

That was that. The Navy paid $5,126 each for the radios and the taxpayers watched $1 million go sailing down the drain. An accessory kit was included that cost an additional $1,593 each. In other words, this one radio cost as much as a Lincoln Continental loaded down with extras—and American industry did not get one chance to cut the cost.

After the hearings were held, and after the contract was let, I continued to follow up this procurement. The contract for the equipment was dated July 18, 1962. I also asked for records of shipments of the radios to see how the production was moving along. Remember, Mr. BeLieu made a big thing of the fact that he needed this equipment for the military 10 months after the award of contract, so the award had to go to Collins Radio, supposedly the only firm that could produce that fast.

Mr. Speaker, that was 1 year ago—and Collins still has not delivered a single unit of the AN/PRC–41. In a letter dated June 7, 1963, Vice Adm. George Beardsley smugly said no delivery was required as yet under terms of the contract.

The reason for this is simply that, after Mr. BeLieu's allegations about a hard and fast delivery schedule that started in 10 months, a contract was signed that authorized a delivery schedule that was greatly relaxed, terminating some 17 months after the date of the contract.

Early this month, Mr. Speaker, I was reading the Department of Commerce Business Daily dated June 5, and on page 4 what did I find but that the Navy Department is currently processing another sole-source award for 143 additional units of the AN/PRC–41 because, this time, delivery is urgently required by the Air Force.

No hint of competition is mentioned. It is another sole-source deal that will slit the throat of the taxpayer a little deeper. To say I was disturbed would be putting it mildly. When an Assistant Secretary of the Navy comes to a committee of this Congress and makes a pledge, we should see he lives up to it.

Mr. BeLieu's action in sole sourcing this radio again shows what he thinks of his words uttered before this Congress. It shows the regard in which he holds this House and the position to which Members of Congress are relegated by the military.

Maybe it is no crime to waste the taxpayers' money, but it ought to be. We allow nonprofessional people such as BeLieu to supervise the spending of billions, and the result is that favored companies get fat at the Government trough while others stand outside and press their faces against the windows, hoping someone will drop a crumb out of the window.

Now, why is this the case? Why do some companies get sole-source contract after sole-source contract, fat profit after fat profit? You will remember I said earlier that the firms play by the rules.

Well, one of those rules is evidently to hire ex-service people who have friends and influence inside procurement sections. This leads to fat contracts. If you think it does not then listen closely.

At my request last year, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Joseph Campbell, supplied me with the record of naval personnel, military and civilian, who have left the employ of the United States to go to work for Collins.

By actual count there were 134 individual ex-Navy officials working on Collins' payroll. This is just ex-Navy personnel. I did not go into the Army and Air Force people on the payroll.

Virtually all of them were at the middle and top levels, in positions where, directly or indirectly, they could bring their past contacts to bear.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert in my remarks the names of these people who the GAO found were working for Collins, showing the rank or grade they held at the time they left the Navy, the date they left the Navy, and the date they joined Collins. It also shows their rank at Collins.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1962.

Hon. EARL WILSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Reference is made to your letter of June 6, 1962, copy enclosed, requesting a record of naval personnel, military and civilian, who have left the employ of the U.S. Navy in the past 5 years and who have subsequently gone to work for Collins Radio Co.

There is attached as enclosure 1 [see exhibit 1] a list of administrative, supervisory, and engineering personnel presently employed by Collins Radio Co. at its Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Newport Beach, Calif.; and Dallas, Tex., locations, who left the active service or employment of the Navy (including the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard) after June 1, 1957. In accordance with a discussion with Mr. Philip Cole of your office, we have limited our review to these classifications of employees. We have not reviewed the personnel records of hourly rated factory employees, office clerical employees, or other classifications of subordinate employees.

During the course of our review, Collins informed us of a group of employees on its Dallas, Tex., payroll classified as employees of their "vice president government representatives department," and indicated that many of such employees have direct contacts with the Navy and the other Federal departments and agencies. We are, therefore, attaching as enclosure 2 [see exhibit 2] a list of these employees for your information.

The information in these exhibits was obtained from personnel reports furnished us by Collins Radio Co. for employees on their Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Dallas, Tex.; and Newport Beach, Calif., payrolls and from the individual personnel files maintained at these locations.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

EXHIBIT 1

Collins Radio Co. administrative, supervisory, and engineering employees who were in the service or employ of the Department of the Navy within the past 5 years (since June 1, 1957)

PERSONNEL ON DALLAS, TEX., PLANT PAYROLL

Name of individual	Navy rank or grade [1]	Date of leaving Navy	Date employed by Collins	Title of position at Collins
O'Reilly, Lawrence P.	Corporal (USMC)	Nov. 5, 1959	Nov. 10, 1959	Foreman II.
Miniter, John J.	Librarian, U.S. Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, New London, Conn.	Mar. 25, 1960	Apr. 4, 1960	Manager, central information services.
Brooks, Marion A.	CE-1 (Navy, Seabees) (electrician and telephone repairman)	May 2, 1958	Mar. 6, 1961	Junior assistant field service engineer.
Drews, Gerald E.	Lieutenant (jg.)	May 23, 1961	June 5, 1961	Systems engineer.
Byrd, Douglas M., Jr.	Test aircraft and equipment for Navy, U.S. Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent, Md.	Aug. —, 1958	June 8, 1959	Junior assistant engineer.
Stephenson, George, Jr.	Lieutenant (jg.)	July 2, 1959	Dec. 4, 1961	Do.
Veeck, Harry (NMI)	Chief electronic technician	Aug. 20, 1959	Sept. 8, 1959	Assistant engineering writer.
Heron, Lawrence W.	Commander (retired)	Aug. 1, 1958	Aug. 11, 1958	Senior systems engineer II.
Houston, Roland H.	GS-13, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C.	July 12, 1957	Aug. 12, 1957	Do.
Goss, Gerald E.	Lieutenant Colonel (USMC)	June 30, 1959	July 15, 1959	Project director I.
Hop, Harvey N.	Commander (Navy)	Jan. 12, 1959	Sept. 1, 1959	Director flight operation.
Flanagan, Thomas G.	ETNSN (electronic technician seaman)	June 19, 1959	Apr. 30, 1962	Junior buyer.
Scalise, Anthony (NMN)	SA (apprentice seaman)	Aug. 3, 1961	Sept. 18, 1961	Junior cost estimator.
Davis, Robert T.	Chief storekeeper	Aug. 31, 1959	Sept. 1, 1959	Supervisor, contract analysis section.
Sewell, William B.	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Jan. 28, 1960	Feb. 1, 1960	Buyer.
Bruton, Henry C.	Rear admiral	Aug. 1, 1960	Jan. 16, 1961	Director, marine systems division.
Tittle, Ira O.	Staff sergeant (USMC)	Oct. 1, 1957	Jan. 22, 1962	Job analyst.
Hess, Robert F.	(Student electrical engineering aid)	[2]	June 15, 1961	Junior field service engineer.
Garnett, Grosvenor H.	FTI (fire control technician)	Nov. 14, 1959	Feb. 15, 1961	Junior assistant engineer.
Gregory, Roland E.	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Jan. 15, 1958	June 15, 1960	Do.
Rottenberg, Aaron M.	Lieutenant colonel (USMC)	June 1, 1960 [3]	Apr. 4, 1960	Systems engineer V.
Bill, Robert G.	Commander	Jan. 1, 1961 [3]	Jan. 6, 1961	Project director IV.
Mather, Donald I.	Captain	Apr. 30, 1960 [3]	May 1, 1960	Senior field engineer.
Cuthbert, Thomas R., Jr.	Lieutenant commander	Sept. —, 1956	Jan. 7, 1959	Systems project engineer.
Johnson, Richard J.	Commander	Dec. —, 1954	Feb. 24, 1960	Engineering pilot.
Suratt, Richard L.	[4]	[4]	Apr. 9, 1962	Senior systems engineer I.
Pels, John H., III	Lieutenant, U.S. Navy	June 30, 1959	July 1, 1959	Sales information coordinator.
Beans, Richard C. [5]	Contract negotiator, BuShips, U.S. Navy	Apr. —, 1960	June 27, 1960	Contract administrator.
Hearn, Ormond E. [5]	Commander, U.S. Navy, last assignment was U.S. Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C.	Dec. 1, 1961	Dec. 12, 1961	Senior field engineer.
Coffee, John M., Jr. [5]	Technical adviser, U.S. Navy, director of communications, Washington, D.C.	Dec. —, 1959	Jan. 4, 1960	Do.

PERSONNEL ON CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, PLANT PAYROLL

Bailey, William K.	RELE (W-1) Coast Guard O-I-C CG Radio Station, NOC, Bermuda.	June—, 1960 [3]	July 6, 1960	Junior assistant engineer.
Bruce, Wilbur W.	AT-2 (aviation electronics technician)	July 16, 1958	June 26, 1961	Field service engineer II.
Camp, Marvin J.	AT-2 (aviation electronics technician) VS-32 NAS, Quonset Point, R.I.	Sept. 23, 1959	Oct. 15, 1959	Junior industrial engineer.
Campion, Richard J.	Lieutenant (jg.), assistant communications officer, U.S.S. *Newport News* (CA-148).	July 25, 1959	Nov. 4, 1959	Associate cost estimator.
Christensen, Ronald L.	AT-1 (aviation electronics technician) FAS-5 NAS, Oceana, Va.	June 2, 1958	July 8, 1958	Supervisor, system data section.
Cole, Benjamin I., Jr.	Lieutenant (jg.), mobile audit staff, Detroit, Mich., auditor (Industrial Costs) U.S. Navy, Audit Office, Dallas.	June 20, 1958 Mar. 18, 1960	Mar. 21, 1960	Manager, parts and services.
Crain, Leo M.	Staff sergeant, USMC, Radio technician	Nov. —, 1959	Jan. 20, 1960	Field service engineer I.
DeFrance, LaVerne A. W.	Lieutenant (jg.), Coast Guard, district industrial manager, 9th CG District, Cleveland, Ohio.	Feb. 26, 1962	Mar. 5, 1962	Assistant cost estimator.
Eddy, Donald E.	Lieutenant (junior grade), Navy, pilot with ASW squadron	Nov. —, 1959	Oct. 23, 1961	Field service engineer IV.
Ellwood, Walter L.	Staff sergeant, USMC, NCOIC hydraulic shop for aircraft	Apr. 20, 1959	Feb. 12, 1962	Field support engineer II.
Fernau, Robert D.	RM-2 radio operator, U.S.S. *Princeton* (CVS-37)	Sept. 21, 1957	Apr. 25, 1962	Quality control engineer I.
Gisler, Charles C.	Corporal, USMC, stock requisition clerk	Feb. 16, 1957	Aug. 28, 1957	Inventory records analyst.
Gray, Woodrow W., Jr.	FT-2, fire technician, U.S.S. *Gyatt* (DDG-1)	Aug. 18, 1959	Aug. 24, 1959	Field support representative.
Gulbro, Robert D.	FT-2, fire technician	Sept. 25, 1959	Nov. 9, 1959	Field service engineer I.
Hall, Norman G.	YN-2, U.S. Coast Guard	July 8, 1959	Aug. 24, 1959	Buyer (junior).
Hawkins, Earl A.	ET-1, electronics technician, Navy, USNRTC, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.	June —, 1959	June 10, 1959	Junior assistant field service engineer.
Hunstad, Vernon D.	Sergeant, USMC, Rep. Br. Bn., elect. company, M.C.S.C., Albany, Ga.	Sept. 21, 1957	Oct. 8, 195	Foreman II.
Jackson, Howard E., Jr.	ET-2, electronic technician, U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, Calif., GS-4, engineering aid.	Mar. 22, 1955 Sept. —, 1958	June 8, 1959	Junior assistant engineer.
Johnston, George W.	Aviation electronics chief, NAS, Norfolk, Va. (instructor in electronics school).	Aug. —, 1961 [3]	Sept. 12, 1961	Field service engineer II.
Jones, John P.	Commander, Navy, Head of Electronic Materials Branch, BuShips.	Sept. 1, 1961 [3]	Sept. 1, 1961	Director of field operations.
Korp, Kenneth L.	CT-3, communications technician	Aug. 10, 1957	June 15, 1961	Junior engineer special distribution.
Lane, Richard C.	ET-1 electronic technician, Navy, U.S.S. *Nereus* (AS-17)	June 13, 1960	July 5, 1960	Foreman II.
Love, Robert E., Jr.	Sergeant, USMC, electronic technician	July 7, 1959	Jan. 29, 1962	Field service engineer II.
Luiken, Donald G.	Lieutenant (jg.), electrical officer on U.S.S. *Princeton* (CVS-37)	July 1, 1958	Aug. 11, 1958	Junior assistant engineer.

See footnotes at end of table.

Collins Radio Co. administrative, supervisory, and engineering employees who were in the service or employ of the Department of the Navy within the past 5 years (since June 1, 1957)—Continued

PERSONNEL ON DALLAS, TEX., PLANT PAYROLL

Name of individual	Navy rank or grade [1]	Date of leaving Navy	Date employed by Collins	Title of position at Collins
Lutz, Richard (NMN)	AT–1, aviation electronics technician	Nov. —, 1957	June 19, 1961	Junior engineer special distribution.
Maley, Paul L.	Chief warrant officer, Navy radio maintenance division, officer at NAS, Corpus Christi, Tex.	July —, 1959 [2]	Feb. 1, 1960	Field support engineer II.
Moloney, William J.	Electronic technician at Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass.	Jan. —, 1957	July 7, 1960	Field support engineer I.
Martin, Fenton A.	CWO–2, USMC, electronics maintenance and operations officer, Quantico, Va.	Mar. 31, 1959 [3]	Sept. 21, 1959	Field support engineer II.
Mathis, Mark C., Jr.	Lieutenant (jg.), Navy chief engineer on U.S.S. *Dupbury Bay* (AVP–38).	Aug. 18, 1960	Sept. 29, 1960	Assistant industrial engineer.
Mulbrook, Larry L.	Sergeant, USMC, instructor in guided missile fire control, San Diego, Calif.	Sept. 15, 1957	Sept. 30, 1957	Foreman II.
Muret, Lenos G.	Lieutenant (jg.), Navy engineering officer on U.S.S. *Reaper* (MSO–467).	Feb. —, 1959	Mar. 2, 1959	Junior assistant engineer.
Neal, Gordon L.	GS–7, design engineer, Naval Ordnance Lab., Silver Spring, Md.	Sept. —, 1960	Aug. 30, 1961	Do.
Nelsen, Michael C.	RDSN, Navy, radarman	Dec. 31, 1957	Sept. 15, 1958	Foreman IV.
Nelson, Donald R.	Sergeant, USMC, electronics technician	Jan. 25, 1961	Feb. 8, 1961	Field support engineer I.
Nims, John K.	Petty officer 1st class, Coast Guard	June 3, 1957	Mar. 30, 1959	Field service engineer II.
O'Brien, Edward L., Jr.	AT–1, Navy, radar shop supervisor, Naval Air Facility, Annapolis, Md.	Dec. 12, 1958	Jan. 12, 1959	Junior engineer writer.
Potter, Dale E.	ET–2, Navy, electronic technician on U.S.S. *Shangri La* (CVA–38).	June —, 1961	June 5, 1961	Field service representative.
Rees, Morgan (NMN)	ETC, Navy, instructor of basic electricity and electronics, Navy Technical School, Great Lakes, Ill.	Apr. 2, 1962 [2]	Apr. 23, 1962	Field support engineer II.
Reid, Donald O.	FT–2, Navy, maintained radar on U.S.S. *Hollister* (DD–788)	July 8, 1959	July 27, 1959	Field support engineer I.
Reinhardt, Marion L.	ET–1, Navy, electronics technician	July 18, 1957	Feb. 5, 1962	Junior engineer specialist distribution.
Riley, James E.	Navy, Washington, D.C., assistant counsel	Nov. —, 1958	Dec. 1, 1958	General counsel—Sales.
Sands, Berne R.	INSMAT, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, contract administrator	June 1, 1958	June 2, 1958	Contract administrator.
Smith, Danny F.	1st Lieutenant, USMC, naval aviator	June 28, 1958	Jan. 18, 1960	Assistant systems analyst.
Soli, John E.	Lieutenant (jg), Navy, electronics material officer on U.S.S. *Cogswell* (DD–651).	Oct. 25, 1960	Jan. 16, 1961	R. & D. program forecast analyst.
Soule, Craig W.	AT–2, Navy, aviation electronics technician	May 11, 1958	Feb. 15, 1961	Junior industrial engineer.
Spade, Vincent E.	Master sergeant, USMC, test chief at Marine Corps Equipment Board, Quantico, Va.	Oct. 31, 1959 [2]	Nov. 16, 1959	Field support engineer II.
Spencer, James L.	Electronic engineer at Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Silver Spring, Md. worked June–September 1960.	Sept. —, 1960	Aug. 1, 1961	Junior assistant engineer.
Stehr, Paul W.	1st Lieutenant, USMC, communication officer, Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.	June 5, 1961	July 26, 1961	Government sales representative.
Steinbeck, Gary L.	ET–3, Navy, electronics technician on U.S.S. *Fessenden* (DER–142).	May 27, 1958	July 1, 1958	Field service engineer I.
Sudduth, Joseph F.	Captain, USMC, member of Electronics Section, Marine Corps Equipment Board, Quantico, Va.	May —, 1960 [3]	May 16, 1960	Senior field engineer III.
Thompson, Richard L.	Electronic inspector at INSMAT, Cedar Rapids, Iowa (Collins)	May —, 1960	June 13, 1960	Quality control engineer II.
Thomson, Murl H.	Branch inspection supervisor at ISNMAT, Cedar Rapids, Iowa (Collins).	Oct. —, 1959	Oct. 26, 1959	Quality control eingneer III.
Treese, Ray, Jr. (NMN)	AT–2, aviation electronic technician	Sept. 11, 1959	Sept. 30, 1959	Junior industrial engineer.
Tyrrel, Sylvan F., Jr.	AT–2, Navy, aviation electronics technician	Nov. 19, 1959	Nov. 30, 1959	Field support engineer II.
Van Gilder, Terry W.	ET–2, Navy, electronics technician on U.S.S. *Ault* (DD–698)	Apr. 4, 1958	Aug. 8, 1960	Apprentice engineer writer.
Walters, Charles W.	ATC, Navy, branch supervisor, Naval Air Weapons Systems School, NAS, Jacksonville, Fla.	Oct. 6, 1959 [3]	Mar. 29, 1960	Senior field engineer I.
Westbrook, John F.	CPO, Navy, supervisor inspector, electronic maintenance, NAS, Dallas, Tex.	June 14, 1960 [3]	June 16, 1960	Field support engineer I.
Woodman, William F., Jr.	W–3, chief communications technician, Navy, assigned to Headquarters Staff, Naval Security Group, Washington, D.C.	Feb. 28, 1959 [3]	Mar. 2, 1959	Field support engineer IV.
Woods, Wilbur J.	SK–2, Navy	June 19, 1958	July 15, 1958	Computer programer A.
Yakeley, Jay B., Jr.	Commander (retired as captain), Navy, assistant to Director, Flight Services Division, CNO Staff, Washington, D.C.	Nov. 1, 1959 [3]	Nov. 9, 1959	Senior associate engineer, special distribution.

PERSONNEL ON NEWPORT BEACH, CALIF., PLANT PAYROLL

Lamareaux, E. P.	USMC corporal	Mar. 20, 1959	Apr. 1, 1959	Engineering assistant.
Stillman, G. T.	GS–7	Dec. —, 1960	June 26, 1961	Junior assistant engineer.
Hanzel, A. L.	Physicist	Oct. —, 1959	May 1, 1961	Associate engineer.
Williams, R. G.	Lieutenant (jg.)	Feb. —, 1959	Mar. 5, 1962	Assistant industrial engineer.
Goens, D. E.	MMI–P1	Dec. 2, 1960 [3]	Feb. 9, 1961	Foreman III.
Dyer, D. V.	AQ–2	Dec. 17, 1958	Dec. 22, 1958	Specifications writer.
Carroll, B. C.	Junior engineer	Sept. —, 1958	June 15, 1959	Assistant engineer.
Wyatt, R. D.	Electronic engineer	Jan. 6, 1961	Jan. 9, 1961	Do.
Morris, H. T.	Lieutenant (jg.)	June 30, 1960	July 25, 1960	Associate contract administrator.
Slocum, D. R.	SK–3 storekeeper	Sept. —, 1957	Jan. 5, 1959	Do.
Leeth, R. G., Jr.	Contract specialist	Aug. —, 1959 [4]	Aug. 16, 1959	Contract aministrator.
Nicholson, L. L., Jr.	Lieutenant commander	Dec. 1, 1957	Jan. 1, 1958	Senior field engineer.
White, J. B.	Electronic mechanic	Sept. —, 1959	July 11, 1960	Assistant engineer.
Parker, R. R.	Electronic engineer	July —, 1957	Nov. 1, 1960	Associate engineer special distribution.
Catozza, D. T., Jr.	USMC master sergeant	June 30, 1960 [3]	Oct. 11, 1960	Junior contract coordinator.
Bruce, J. P.	ETR2	Sept. 7, 1957	June 15, 1959	Junior engineer.
Calelli, A. D.	USMC corporal	Aug. 12, 1958	Oct. 6, 1958	Foreman II.
Kesterson, R. D.	AN	Aug. 3, 1959	Aug. 10, 1959	Do.
Thayer, G. E.	USMC gunnery sergeant E–9	Feb. 28, 1961 [2]	June 2, 1961	Engineering assistant.

[1] Includes Marine Corps and Coast Guard.
[2] Summer 1960.
[3] Retired.
[4] From May 1958 to January 1962. Employed by Pan American Airlines, Guided Missile Range Division, Patrick Air Force Base, Fla. Deputy manager engineering and assistant plant superintendent. From September 1956 to May 1958. President and owner of R. L. Suratt, consulting engineers, New York and Washington, D.C. Duties: Collaborated with various naval architects and design agents on design criteria for special launching devices for guided missile cruisers. Performed extensive ship alterations and modifications on U.S. naval ammunition and supply ships.
[5] See exhibit 2 for additional employment details.
[6] Employed by BuShips, Washington, D.C., from March 1958 to August 1959.

EXHIBIT 2

Collins Radio Co., Dallas, Tex.—List of employees in vice president government representatives department (exclusive of secretaries and stenographers)

Name of individual	Employment location	Government or armed service		Date employed by Collins	Title of position at Collins	Government office(s) contacted
		Grade or rank	Date of leaving			
Dutton, Robert P.	Washington, D.C.	Lieutenant (junior grade) A–V–(s) in U.S. Naval Reserve.	Still in Reserve	Jan. 16, 1952	Vice president, government representative.	No assigned agency. May call on any agency as required throughout the United States.
Johnson, Theodore A.	do	Staff sergeant, U.S. Army	Mar. 29, 1946	Jan. 28, 1952	Director, Government representative.	Same as above. Assistant to Mr. Dutton.

Collins Radio Co., Dallas, Tex.—List of employees in vice president government representatives department (exclusive of secretaries and stenographers)—Continued

Name of individual	Employment location	Government or armed service		Date employed by Collins	Title of position at Collins	Government office(s) contacted
		Grade or rank	Date of leaving			
Sneed, James W., Jr	Dayton, Ohio	1st lieutenant, U.S. Air Force. Technician, Naval Base, Orange, Tex.	May 1945 October 1949	Aug. 2, 1954	Senior associate field engineer.	Aeronautical Systems Division, U.S. Air Force, Dayton, Ohio.
Strathern, William	Rome, N.Y.	Staff sergeant, U.S. Air Force.	August 1951	Mar. 13, 1961	Associate field engineer.	Rome Air Development Center and Rome Air Material Area, Air Force.
Beller, Earl J	Los Angeles, Calif.	Colonel, Signal Corps, U.S. Army.	Sept. 30, 1954 (retired).	Apr. 6, 1957	Senior associate field engineer.	West coast area, primarily Ballistics Missile Division Air Force, Space Systems Division, Air Force, Pacific Missile Range and Navy Purchasing Office, Los Angeles, Calif.
Abercrombie, Everette G	Washington, D.C.	None		June 6, 1957	Principal field engineer.	Primarily Navy, including Bureau of Weapons, Bureau of Ships, Marine Corps, and Bureau of Yards and Docks, Washington, D.C.
Pels, John H., III	Dallas, Tex.	Lieutenant, U.S. Navy	June 30, 1959	July 1, 1959	Sales information coordinator.	NASA, Houston, Tex., as temporary assignment.
Allott, William T., Jr	Washington, D.C.	Staff sergeant, U.S. Air Force.	Jan. 16, 1956	July 27, 1959	Senior associate field engineer.	No particular account assignment but covers microwave requirements with any agency in Washington, D.C., as required.
Barnette, E. F	Dayton, Ohio	1st lieutenant, U.S. Air Force.	Oct. 15, 1959	Oct. 15, 1959	Senior assistant field engineer.	Aeronautical Systems Division, U.S. Air Force, Dayton, Ohio.
Newitt, J. H	Boston, Mass.	None			Senior associate field engineer.	Electronic Systems Division, U.S. Air Force, Boston, Mass.
Judson, Robert R	Washington, D.C.	1st lieutenant, U.S. Army. Contract negotiator, Bureau of Ships, U.S. Navy, Washington, D.C.	January 1954 Apr. 15, 1960	Apr. 25, 1960	Contract administrator.	No specific assignment. Covers contract administration matters with Army, Navy, NASA, USIA, and any others.
Beans, Richard C	do	Private, first class, U.S. Marine Corps. Contract negotiator, Bureau of Ships, U.S. Navy.	January 1945 April 1960	June 27, 1960	do	Same as R. R. Judson above but also covers Avionics Supply Office and Defense Supply Agency at Philadelphia, Pa.
Hearn, Ormond E	Washington, D.C.	Commander, U.S. Navy, last assignment was U.S. Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C.	Dec. 1, 1961 (retired).	Dec. 12, 1961	Senior field engineer	NASA, Washington, D.C.
Stitely, Allen H	Fort Monmouth, N.J.	Master Sergeant, U.S. Marine Corps.	Dec. 31, 1954	Jan. 3, 1962	do	U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory, Fort Monmouth, N.J.
Waldrup, William E	Dallas, Tex.	Captain, U.S. Air Force	Aug. 16, 1952	Dec. 26, 1957	do	Various Army and Air Force bases in Texas, Georgia, Alabama, and throughout the central southern area.
Coffee, John M., Jr	Washington, D.C.	Technical adviser, U.S. Navy, Director of Communications, Washington, D.C. Technical adviser, U.S. Army, office, chief signal officer, Washington, D.C. Technical planning of communications, U.S. Army Signal Communications Security Agency, Arlington Hall Station, Arlington, Va. Computer design, U.S. Army Security Agency, Arlington, Va.	December 1959 January 1958 February 1956 November 1955	Jan. 4, 1960	do	No particular account assignment. Covers data requirements with all agencies in District of Columbia area as required.
Lasley, Jonathan H	do	Lieutenant commander, U.S. Naval Reserve.	March 1946	Apr. 1, 1957	Principal field engineer.	International and nonmilitary Government agencies such as Department of State, etc.
Culp, Joe C	do	Electronic engineer, U.S. Army Signal Engineering Agency, Arlington, Va. 1st lieutenant, U.S. Army.	July 1958 February 1958	Sept. 15, 1958	Senior associate field engineer.	Primarily Army and also Defense Communications Agency, Defense Atomic Support Agency, Diamond Ordnance Fuze Laboratory, Joint Communication Agency.
Cagney, William M	Rome, N.Y.	do	Dec. 28, 1945	July 1, 1959	Principal field engineer.	Rome Air Material Area, Rome Air Development Center, U.S. Air Force.
Chaires, William R	Washington, D.C.	Major, U.S. Army Signal Corps.	Jan. 31, 1960	Feb. 1, 1960	Senior field engineer	Primarily Army and FAA.
Curs, Luther S	do	Lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army.	Feb. 1, 1946	June 23, 1960	Senior quality control engineer.	Assists Mr. E. G. Abercrombie and also covers Coast Guard and various Navy technical installations such as NADC and Navy Research Laboratory.
McCaddon, Joseph F	do	Major, U.S. Air Force	June 3, 1955	Jan. 6, 1961	Senior government representative.	Primarily Air Force in Washington, D.C., and Tactical Air Command in Langley, Va., and Advanced Research Projects Agency.
Potter, John	Cocoa Beach, Fla., (Cape Canaveral).	CH radio technician, U.S. Navy Reserve.	Aug. 29, 1946	Aug. 1, 1961	Senior field engineer	Air Force Test Center, Patrick Air Force Base, Fla., and Atlantic Missile Range at Cape Canaveral.

Take a good look at those people, Mr. Speaker. Let us take just two names—Robert Judson and Richard Beans. Both of these men were contract negotiators working in the Navy Department Bureau of Ships. It is possible, I am told, they processed contracts that went to Collins, and I have today asked the Comptroller General to supply me with a complete list of any and all contracts and dollar amounts they processed to Collins in their last 3 years of Navy service. When this material is supplied, it will be made public.

There is another thing that concerns me besides the fact that Collins—and other firms—have found it advantageous to hire ex-military people. This other thing is the kind of people who sometimes surround our top Defense Department officials. There is an individual, Mr. Speaker, whom I shall not name at this time because of other work currently going on in this area. This person works for Mr. BeLieu in a critical position. The Office of Naval Intelligence has a complete report on this individual and, certainly, Mr. BeLieu also has this information, or should have. The report, I understand, goes into detail as to the enormous excesses of this person whose services were terminated in the Bureau of Ships in 1951. This person's previous supervisor stated he was confident this individual gave out confidential information to certain manufacturers where in some instances negotiated bids were changed at a late date or two or three times in one day. This report goes into detail and even mentions the fact that this person was tempted by Communists at one time before breaking off contacts 6 months after they were initiated.

This is just one person, Mr. Speaker, and while one bad apple does not always spoil a barrel, it certainly can speed the spoilage process for the rest.

It might be said that personalities have no place in procurement studies, but personalities make up the Navy, Mr. Speaker, as they make up all groups. Personalities make the decisions that commit billions of tax dollars, and they should get the credit for their decisions, be they good or bad.

The only question that remains in my mind, Mr. Speaker, is just how long we Members of Congress will allow the waste, the corruption, the inefficiency, the incompetency to exist. How long will we allow these men to silently in concert help this country along the road to financial chaos before we take action?

Mr. Speaker, this is a nonpartisan question. It is the business of all Americans, regardless of political affiliation. Secretary McNamara is a good man trying to do a good job, but what chance does any Secretary have when the people below him are feathering their nests for the future, padding their cushions for today and getting the stuffing from the lifeblood of the American taxpayer?

Now is the time to start removing this malignancy that eats at the vitals of our Nation, and, in my opinion, a good place to begin is with Mr. BeLieu, who told us one thing last year and went right out to set the gears in motion to do something else. This is the same Mr. BeLieu who violated provisions of Public Law 87–653 by initiating a sole-source contract for a drone radio without first providing a justification for the act. While Mr. BeLieu can rationalize for hours at a time, he cannot deny he knew the law was being passed because he is one of the service people who opposed its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, refer to the table of former Navy employees now with Collins. You will notice that none are actually in charge of any purchasing departments as many were in the Navy. Maybe it is because Collins does not want these people to oversee any of its dollars because of their performance in this respect when they were Government employees.

This is just another reason why my bill, H.R. 4409, should be enacted. A committee of this Congress would then be watching daily and in minute detail the machinations of our Defense machinery which will spend $47 billion next year.

ECONOMY IN CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to repeal section 100 of title 2 of the United States Code providing a storage trunk to each of the Members of the Congress annually. The Congress has presently been cast in a poor light with regard to its own spending, and this seems an area where we could cut back expenditures without jeopardizing the functions of the Congress or seriously inconveniencing any of the Members.

The carpenter in the House Office Building indicates that there are no charges for crating and packaging various items that may from time to time need to be stored. This seems a much more effective and economical way to deal with our storage needs than to have a provision to provide a large, and often unneeded and unwanted trunk to each of the Members annually. This is a small area of waste in the ancillary functionings of the Congress which we should move promptly to eliminate.

DUTY ON POLISHED SHEETS AND PLATES OF IRON AND STEEL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my hopes for the passage of H.R. 3674. This bill, which amends the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates, has carried my wholehearted support; in fact, this bill is identical to H.R. 3099 which I introduced into this body. H.R. 3674, like H.R. 3099, would correct an unintended anomaly in the Tariff Act of 1930 which threatens to decimate an important American industry.

Under the Tariff Act of 1930 unpolished stainless steel is dutiable at 13½ percent ad valorem; if, however, the stainless steel is polished, it is duitable at 1¼ cents per pound, a rate equivalent to only 3 percent ad valorem. By the relatively simple process of polishing, then, foreign producers may sneak through this loophole all stainless steel sheets and plates while paying only a 3-percent ad valorem duty. Commerce Department statistics on stainless steel imports demonstrate the danger to this viable segment of domestic manufacture. Upon the discovery of this tariff discrepancy between polished and unpolished stainless steel, importation of stainless steel sheets and plates jumped ninefold from 1961 to 1962. Imports for the first 5 weeks of 1963 exceeded total stainless steel imports for the years 1955–61.

Corrective legislation is the only solution which will effectively prevent the continuation of grave injury to stainless steel manufacturing in the United States. In the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 this inequality between polished and unpolished stainless steel is eliminated. Unfortunately, implementation of this adjustment has been delayed. Meanwhile, imports continue to pour into this country. I hope the House will see the necessity of acting immediately on this issue.

The State of Pennsylvania, where serious unemployment problems still persist, is a center of the stainless steel industry in the United States. I urge the House to close this tariff inequity and save the jobs of many citizens of my State at a time when every single employment opportunity is so dear.

MIGRANT CONDITIONS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 78, the Bracero Act, met a possible death in this House recently when we voted down a 2-year extension of that law.

During that debate and since, some Members spoke as if the lot of the domestic migrant workers was not deplorable enough to concern us. That is a tragic and unforgivable indifference to the plight of one of the most exploited groups of our population. We should all be ashamed of such indifference in our minds.

Let us look realistically at the domestic migrant's condition. He earned only $6.25 per day in 1962, and averaged only $1,054 per year including his nonfarm labor. How can our consciences allow such a condition to continue? How could we possibly refuse to set free the market forces which would improve his condition, a step we can take by refusing to extend Public Law 78?

A director of a west coast region packinghouse union, during the hearings on Public Law 78 this year, vividly commented after describing the absence of toilet and handwashing facilities for the migrants:

> Most consumers would gag on the salad if they saw these conditions, the lack of sanitary conditions, under which these products are grown and processed.

A Texas migrant worker, told the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor:

> I don't call it a good life. A fellow would call it a good life when he comes to enjoy it, when he make very good money. That is the only way he can enjoy life. When you go into the field and work 12 to 15 hours a day, do you think that is enjoying life? No, no. That is why I am crippled now, because I worked too hard in those fields. You have to understand such things as that. It is not enjoying life.

Do not these workers deserve a vastly improved economic life? Are we going to be inhumane enough to refuse them that because we are afraid to let a small sector of agriculture undergo a little free market adjustment?

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POZNAN UPRISING

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, June 27, 1963, marks the seventh anniversary of the heroic Polish uprising in Poznan, which produced the first serious setback to communism in Europe since World War II.

That inspiring uprising came as no surprise to students of Polish history. For more than 1,000 years, the people of Poland have demonstrated their deep dedication to the principles of freedom and human dignity.

When on June 27, 1956, a large group of students in Poznan led an uprising against their Communist rulers, these young people were writing but another chapter in the glorious book of courage which their Polish predecessors have inscribed in blood against tyranny and oppression.

Nor should it come as any particular surprise that the new Communist regime which replaced the old guard in Poland as a result of this heroic Poznan uprising moved very quickly and decisively to provide the people of Poland with a greater degree of freedom in their daily lives.

Let there be no mistake. Poland continues to be under Communist domination against her will. But the great contribution made by those who participated in the Poznan uprising 7 years ago, was to bring to the people of Poland the first significant breakthrough in the Communists' iron grip upon that brave nation.

The Gomulka regime was forced to give the press of Poland a greater degree of freedom. It was forced to resign itself to the fact that Cardinal Wyszynski and religious freedom in Poland stand indomitable. And it was further forced to acknowledge the fact that the Polish farmer would not tolerate nationalization of his farmlands.

In the wake of the Polish uprising, a whole series of other reforms were instituted.

Weighed against the complete freedom of an American, the newly won liberties experienced by the Poles after the Poznan uprising would indeed appear minuscule. But in a country which, since the beginning of World War II, has been enslaved by the most barbaric methods of suppression at the hands of both the Nazis and the Communists, these were, indeed, staggering gains. These newly won liberties following the Poznan uprising produced a rebirth of hope and inspiration that Poland would again someday rejoin the family of free nations.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, these hard-won liberties in a sea of Communist tyranny cannot be minimized.

It is easy enough for those who have never felt the full brutality of oppression to talk of the grand plan for freedom. I wonder what their attitude would be if they had to carve out this freedom in a nation like Poland which was, prior to June 27, 1956, under the complete domination of heavily armed Soviet troops internally and surrounded on all sides of her borders by massive Soviet armies externally.

The full scope of these gallant Poles' monumental contribution on the altar of freedom in the Poznan uprising can be measured only when we recognize fully the staggering odds against their success.

The fact that this brave adventure in the cause of freedom brought to Poland a new wave of liberty demonstrated again why tyrants throughout the ages have learned to respect that undying spirit of the Poles.

Poznan was completely surrounded by Soviet tanks during this heroic uprising. Undaunted, rebellious Poles fought these steel behemoths with their hands, wooden clubs, stones, and whatever other weapons they could find.

Mr. Speaker, the world cannot let the seventh anniversary of the Poznan uprising go unnoticed, particularly as I believe that we are today on the threshold of an entirely new situation developing among the captive nations. Even though 7 years have elapsed, the spirit of the Poznan uprising continues to this day.

The Communist rulers of Poland, under tremendous pressure, have made repeated attempts to curtail the limited liberties won by the Poles in the Poznan uprising. These Communist efforts have failed and I predict they will continue to fail so long as one single Pole is denied his rightful freedom and dignity.

There is reason to hope, on this seventh anniversary of the Poznan uprising, that President Kennedy will return from his very successful journey to Europe with a new formula for the eventual liberation of the captive nations without bloodshed or internal revolt.

President Kennedy has given Western Europe his unequivocal pledge that the United States will never be a party to the suppression of freedom among our allies. He has spoken with a firmness unparalleled by any other President in the history of the United States that our Nation will never compromise on the principle of freedom for our allies in Europe or for our own people.

President Kennedy dispelled any doubts regarding his stubborn determination that freedom must reign in our own country and the world when he assured the West German people that we are willing to risk our own cities in defense of liberty. He spoke magnificently of our determination to preserve freedom for those who are privileged to enjoy it.

But having said all of this, the President quite properly observed in Berlin that restoration of freedom to those who tragically do not now enjoy it, in Europe is a slow and painstaking process. The President correctly observed that while there can be no question of the ultimate unification of the German nation, this long-awaited day will not occur tomorrow.

It is quite apparent that President Kennedy has reemphasized his determination for restoration of freedom to all the nations of Europe without the risk of nuclear war. It will not surprise me, therefore, to see a new formula emerge in Europe with the full support of the West German administration. One which will call for greater economic exchange between East and West Germany; greater cultural exchanges; a stabilizing of the Berlin situation with an assurance that our integrity and sovereignty in West Berlin will not be impaired; and finally an early recognition of the western boundaries of Poland in order to help free that nation from her complete dependence on the Soviet Union and restore closer relations between Poland and Germany.

I was among those who most bitterly opposed the abstention of the United States when the crucial vote concerning recognition of the Hungarian Communist regime credentials came before the United Nations.

But, if this action is being taken as part of a calculated risk to slowly and methodically pull all of the captive nations away from Moscow rule, then indeed the whole free world must pray for the success of this maneuver.

Perhaps we are witnessing in President Kennedy's very successful trip to Europe the beginning of this long road to freedom for all of Europe.

It would appear to me the prospects of weakening the Soviet grip upon the captive nations are more favorable today than ever before. The Soviet Union, preoccupied with its internal problems with Red China on the one hand, and seeing the great promise of Communist reforms unable to live up to expectations both in

the captive nations and the Soviet Union itself, on the other hand, might very well learn that this particular time is most propitious for the West to launch a gigantic effort toward peaceful liberation of the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, we are today paying tribute to the seventh anniversary of the Poznan uprising. Man's heroic efforts to free himself from tyranny by means of blood and sword has always provided the most inspiring pages of history. In this modern world, however, with its huge tanks, cannons, massive armies, and the overwhelming shadow of nuclear destruction, the struggle for freedom can no longer be resolved by the use of armed force.

Courageous as the Poznan uprising was, the road to freedom for the Polish people and those of all the other captive nations including the Soviet Union, lies in deliberate and determined diplomacy and a resolve that there is more vigor in defending a right than in denouncing a wrong.

Our concept of human dignity and free enterprise, as we Americans know it, is the right to ultimate victory for freedom. This is the right we must always put forward. Only through increased contacts can we convince those now suffering the tyranny of communism that their greatest hope lies in alining themselves with the West and our institutions of freedom.

This is a painstaking process. But victory is within our grasp.

It is for this reason that I feel so certain that observers of the international scene have completely misjudged the real purpose of President Kennedy's mission to Europe.

They have been beguiled by his charming 3-day visit to that lovely land of the leprechaun—Ireland. They have been awed by his spectacular welcome in Germany and West Berlin. They are waiting with great expectation his visit to historic Italy and his audience with the newly elected Pope Paul VI.

However, behind all of this, I submit, Mr. Speaker, was the President's strong desire to meet with the leaders of West Germany; to work out a new course of action for the resolution of the Berlin situation and the forging of a new plan for pulling the entire Soviet satellite complex away from Moscow rule.

On this seventh anniversary of the Poznan uprising, let us all pray, therefore, that these words are not a mere hope. Let us pray they may soon become a reality.

Unlike the heroic Poznan uprising, the final victory over Communist tyranny will not be marked by huge parades and cheering crowds because it will not happen in 1 day, 1 week, or 1 month. The ultimate victory will be won through a long painstaking and deliberate determination that the erosion which follows Communist tyranny must be replaced with fresh hope, ripe for a new harvest of freedom.

On this inspiring seventh anniversary of the Poznan uprising, I pray that President Kennedy's magnificent journey has helped to sow the first seeds for this long-awaited harvest of liberty for all the people of Europe, including the determined Poles, whose heroism is exceeded only by their mature patience and unyielding dedication to human dignity.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, these are dangerous times, and the Government is now making a survey of all buildings which have thick and strong walls—walls which might offer protection against the deadly dangers of the radioactive fallout that would follow an atomic attack. All such shelters are marked and stocked with survival supplies.

In San Antonio, we have what might be the oldest fallout shelter in the United States. It is the famous Mission Concepcion, founded in 1754.

The mission began as a church and shelter for a few courageous priests and their charges. It had to be strong, for the mission was frequently subject to attack by marauding Apache Indians.

Today this same structure is an active church, and now is designated as a shelter for 193 persons in event of an atomic attack. Its walls are thick and strong enough to still offer protection against the enemies in my area.

Mission Concepcion required some 20 years to complete, and it has been hailed by many historians as the most beautifully proportioned of all the missions. The fortress-church was built of limestone cut from nearby quarries, and decorated with colors made of pulverized field stones and goatsmilk. The once vivid colors have long since faded, but the building is sound and in an excellent state of repair.

This Saturday, June 29, 1963, at 10 a.m., I will have the pleasure of joining with the mayor of San Antonio, Bexar County officials, and representatives of the regional, State, and local civil defense for the stocking on the mission.

Part of the survival supplies will be placed in a room once used for drying and preserving meat. The original timbers used for hanging the meat in that room are still there, set solidly into the walls.

History has turned a full circle for this ancient church. It once was a fortress as well as a place of worship. It still finds a use as both. It once protected a few settlers from Indian raids, and once again will offer safety for our citizens against raids of another, of a far more terrible kind.

THE CRUEL MIGRANT LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the migrant system for providing supplemental agricultural labor should be thoroughly studied by a committee of Congress. Better yet, Members of Congress would learn much by actually visiting an agricultural area during the harvest season to personally experience the migrant's plight. I would be pleased to arrange such a tour for any interested Member.

I live in John Steinbeck's home town, Salinas, Calif. "East of Eden" is my home. The Salinas Valley is one of the most productive agricultural areas in the world. "Of Mice and Men" and "Grapes of Wrath" tell some of the story of this beautiful valley—but not the whole story, of course.

One of the cruelest phases of our social-economic life is the migrant labor family. The innocent children suffer most. Until you have lived with a migrant family or have lived in a town through which the migrant families must swarm, you cannot appreciate the cruelties imposed on them by this nomadic way of life.

We mortals cannot change, to any appreciable extent, the time when crops ripen or when harvests are required.

Migrant families, not always through their own fault, seriously disrupt a community. They cause enormous policing problems—crimes and nuisances. They increase extraordinarily relief and welfare requirements. They disrupt schools—preventing local and migrant children both from achieving a proper education.

We in Congress should not encourage this nomadic way of life. The children's deprivations are, among others, a lack of security and a normal home. They lead a disrupted life, without roots, which results in permanent emotional, social, and educational scars. They do not drop out because they are never included in. They cause problems for themselves and for society. A family needs a permanent home; a migrant never has one.

Men, without their families, can more appropriately provide the supplemental agricultural labor. If certain moralists declaim that it is more immoral for a man to work for several months away from his family than to drag his family from farm to farm, then I disagree with the moralists.

A man without his family can follow the crops for several months, earn good money and save it—without dissipating it on the high costs of travel and temporary housing—and return to his permanent home and employment during the major portion of the year.

There are many moral, decent, religious, socially conscious people who believe that the bracero program is a more moral, humanitarian, and decent solution to this very tough, difficult, social-economic problem.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ABERNETHY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. SCHADEBERG), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALL (at the request of Mr. SCHADEBERG), for 30 minutes, on August 9.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DORN.

Mr. FINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS and to include an address by the Postmaster General, Mr. Day, and an announcement by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. SHORT.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SCHADEBERG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SAYLOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. DAWSON.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia," approved February 18, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 489. An act to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 490. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles, and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 743. An act to furnish to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 995. An act to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in acordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1163. An act to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1492. An act to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart;

H.R. 1819. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1937. An act to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940;

H.R. 3537. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6791. An act to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 467. Joint resolution amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 1, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

984. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State transmitting the 11th report on the extent and disposition of U.S. contributions to international organizations for the fiscal year 1962, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 806, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 131); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

985. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follow:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 422. Resolution taking H.R. 3872 from the Speaker's table and sending it to conference; without amendment (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 423. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 134, a bill to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards; without amendment (Rept. No. 479). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 424. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3179, a bill to provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 425. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7139, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 4646. A bill to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream; without amendment (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 2906. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing; with amendment (Rept. No. 483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 312. An act for the relief of Danusia Radochonski; without amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 380. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960 (Private Law 86–354); without amendment (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 409. An act for the relief of Yeng Burdick; without amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 504. An act for the relief of Domenico Martino; without amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 787. An act for the relief of Zofia Miecielica; without amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 7307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to contracts for the extraction of minerals or the severance of timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 7308. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction or credit against tax for contributions to national and State political committees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 7309. A bill to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the public interest, convenience, or necessity may be served, issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by U.S. amateurs on a reciprocal basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 7310. A bill to modify conditions for reduced rate of contributions under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7311. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program of Federal unemployment adjustment benefits, to provide for equalization grants, to extend coverage of the unemployment compensation program, to establish Federal requirements with respect to the weekly benefit amount and limit the tax credits available to employers in a State which does not meet such requirements, to establish a Federal requirement prohibiting States from denying compensation to workers undergoing training and deny tax credits to employers in a State which does not meet such requirement, to increase the wage base for the Federal unemployment tax, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment taxes, to establish a Federal unemployment adjustment and equalization account in the unemployment trust fund, to change the annual certification date under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, to provide for a Special Advisory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 7312. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 7313. A bill to amend section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, relating to products of Communist countries or areas, to require prompt action by the President under the provisions thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 7314. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 7315. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7316. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7317. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 7318. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require that any housing constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area shall be designed for middle- and low-income groups, to prevent the demolition of areas containing housing in good or restorable condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7319. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to insure that urban renewal projects in the District will not destroy areas containing structures in good or restorable condition or result in the construction of housing beyond the means of middle- or low-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7320. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to increase rates of disability and death pension payable thereunder and revise the income limitations applicable thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 7321. A bill to establish certain qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 7322. A bill to establish a Federal Presidential Election Board to conduct preference primaries in connection with the nomination of candidates for President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 7323. A bill to provide that court for the U.S. District Court for the District of Montana shall be held at Bozeman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 7324. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 7325. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo, Tex., to the Amarillo Hospital District of Amarillo, Potter County, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7326. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance programs on a mutual basis, and to authorize loans to cooperatives under such program for replacements, improvements, and repairs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7327. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H.R. 7328. A bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 7329. A bill to amend the criminal laws of the United States to prohibit any person from crossing State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 7330. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 7331. A bill to provide that motor vehicles manufactured after a certain date and to be sold or shipped in interstate commerce shall be equipped with seat belts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 7332. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7333. A bill to repeal the provisions of the act of March 3, 1901, relating to packing boxes for the use of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 7334. A bill to establish the Federal Housing Administration as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7335. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7336. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, to provide for labeling of economic poisons with registration numbers, to eliminate registration under protest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7337. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to foreign commerce in electric energy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7338. A bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 7339. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7340. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 7341. A bill to provide for the modification of the existing project for San Luis Obispo Harbor, Calif., including its renaming as Port San Luis, Calif; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 7342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize partial refunds of the excise taxes paid on gasoline which is used by trucks hauling logs and other raw forest products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7343. A bill to require the establishment of congressional districts within any one State containing approximately the same number of inhabitants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.J. Res. 523. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the right to read from the Holy Bible and to offer nonsectarian prayers in the public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.J. Res. 524. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.J. Res. 525. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.J. Res. 526. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools or other public bodies in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.J. Res. 527. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.J. Res. 528. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools or other public bodies in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.J. Res. 529. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution designating Presidents' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Southwest regional water laboratory should be known as the "Robert S. Kerr Water Research Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H. Res. 420. Resolution congratulating the town of Pomfret, Conn., on its 250th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Res. 421. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the retention in the District of Columbia of a master control record of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rulue XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to deploring and condemning the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States for banning Bible reading and recital of the Lord's prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reaffirm the State workmen's compensation system as the basic program for providing work-connected injuries and disease benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 7344. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lopez Pedroza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 7345. A bill for the relief of H. Ali Iravani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 7346. A bill for the relief of Cornelis Van Nuis, M.D., U.S. Public Health Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 7347. A bill for the relief of Teresa Elliopoulos and Anastasia Elliopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 7348. A bill for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 7349. A bill for the relief of Filemon C. Yao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 7350. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Sun (Kuo-fang Kai Sun); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

172. By Mr. SHRIVER: Resolution of Democratic precinct committeemen and women of the fifth ward, Wichita, Kans., endorsing and commending President Kennedy's civil rights legislative program and urging passage of that program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

173. By The SPEAKER: Petition of Richard F. Kuehnle, Silver Eagles Rescue, International, Walbridge, Ohio, relative to transmitting the charter and constitution of the Silver Eagles Rescue, International, to the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rabbi Harold P. Smith, of the Congregation Agudath Achim, of South Shore, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, we thank Thee, O God, for the gift of another day of life.

As the Members of this august body prepare to use this day for deliberations and actions which will affect the lives and destinies, not only of their own countrymen, but of all humans everywhere, we invoke Thy gracious blessings upon them.

Bless Thou, we pray Thee, our Chief Executive, the President of the United States, and our distinguished legislators, with the good health, the courage, and the wisdom so to act this day that the crises of our world will be lessened, the tensions alleviated, the frictions mitigated, and the hatreds dissolved into love and friendship and understanding.

May the qualities of mind and soul which we, their fellow citizens, saw in them in measure great enough to entrust them with our very destinies, be reflected in their sensitivities and responsiveness to the sufferings, the struggles, and the pains of many who, as we do, seek the fundamental blessings of life, liberty, and unhampered pursuit of happiness, wherever they may be.

May they honor the deep trust we have placed in them by finding, this day, new vistas of insight which Thou alone canst supply, that they may shed a new and alleviating light upon the crucial issues which oft divide us one from another in these critical days when unity and love are so vitally needed for survival.

Help us, O Lord, help us, that we, in these glorious and blessed United States of America, shall indeed be united States, and that all of us shall approach and solve our problems, with love and understanding, in a united state. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 26, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1359) to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6791) to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from the duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.